

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XV, 3.

WHOLE NO. 59.

---

## I.—WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY.<sup>1</sup>

Northampton, Massachusetts, half a century ago, was one of the best examples of a typical New England town—among stately hills, on the banks of the Connecticut River, with broad streets well shaded by great spreading elms, with large homesteads still occupied by the descendants of early settlers, with people of much culture and refinement who were given to "plain living and high thinking." It was the town of Edwards, of Dwight, of Hawley, of Stoddard, of Strong, and of many another worthy. It was the seat of the once famous Round Hill Academy. There, on February 9, 1827, William Dwight Whitney was born,—the second surviving son and fourth child of Josiah Dwight Whitney and Sarah Williston Whitney. His mother was a daughter of the Rev. Payson Williston (Yale, 1783), of Easthampton, and sister of the Hon. Samuel Williston, who founded Williston Seminary. His father was born in Westfield, Mass.,—the oldest son of Abel Whitney, who was graduated at Harvard in 1783.

No company of brothers and sisters of any American family has been so remarkable for scholarly attainments and achievements as that family in Northampton: Josiah D. Whitney, Jr. (Yale, 1839), Professor of Geology at Harvard; William D. Whitney, of Yale; James L. Whitney (Yale, 1856), of the Boston

<sup>1</sup> The writer desires to acknowledge his special obligations to Professor Salisbury for allowing him access to original documents, and to Dr. Hanns Oertel for calling his attention to publications which would otherwise have escaped his notice.

Public Library; Henry M. Whitney (Yale, 1864), Professor of English Literature at Beloit College; Miss Maria Whitney, the first incumbent of the chair of Modern Languages in Smith College.

William D. Whitney was fitted for college in his native town, and entered the Sophomore class of Williams College in 1842, at the age of fifteen. Tradition says that the studies of the college course were easy to him, and that he spent most of his time in wandering over the fields, studying geology and the habits of birds and of plants, although he maintained the first rank for scholarship in his class. On his graduation he pronounced the valedictory oration, on 'Literary Biography.'

After graduation—at eighteen, the age when most now enter college—Mr. Whitney remained for three years in uncertainty with regard to his life-work, meanwhile busy as teller in his father's bank. He did not take an active part in the social life of the young people of Northampton, but employed himself in his own pursuits. His leisure time was given largely to the collection of birds and plants; a large and beautiful case of birds stuffed by him at this period is in the Peabody Museum at New Haven. His tastes for natural science were marked, and he was more than an amateur in that field. He spent the summer of 1849 in the United States Survey of the Lake Superior region, conducted by his eminent brother, Josiah D. Whitney—having "under his charge the botany, the ornithology, and the accounts." In the summer of 1873, also, he was invited to take part in the Hayden exploring expedition in Colorado. The Report of the Survey says that he "rendered most valuable assistance . . . in geographical work." His account of this expedition of 1873 was published in the *New York Tribune*, and afterwards was translated into French for a popular publication of that country, as giving a clear view of the work of such scientific parties. He had a brief article in the *American Journal of Science* for the same year on the U. S. Geological Survey of the Territories. He gave several months of his time just before leaving home for his last visit to Europe, to helping Professor J. D. Whitney put through the press the latter's work on 'The Metallic Wealth of the United States.'

His scientific experience stood him in good stead in more than one instance of philological research and discussion. He was not tempted to infer from linguistic data the order of succession of

trees in forests, nor astronomical facts. He was a member for several years of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. One of his most important publications was the annotated translation of a Hindu treatise on astronomy—the *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, 1860—and one of the longest essays in his 'Oriental and Linguistic Studies' treats of the same subject.

In 1848, largely under the influence and with the encouragement of his father's pastor, the Rev. George E. Day (for a quarter of a century after 1866 Professor of Hebrew at Yale, and at present Dean of the Yale Divinity School), Mr. Whitney directed his attention to the study of Sanskrit, for which he found books in the library of his elder brother, who had recently returned from Europe. A really good mind can find pleasure and success in any one of several different fields of research. Not often, however, do we find such marked examples of men of real talent manifesting distinct tastes and power in widely different departments of learning as in the case of these two brothers. Mr. J. D. Whitney went to Germany primarily in order to prepare himself for mineralogical and geological work, but became interested in the study of languages and attended (with but two fellow-listeners) a course of lectures on Sanskrit at Berlin. He himself says that he might have taken up philology in earnest, abandoning natural science altogether, if immediately after his return to his home he had not received an appointment to engage in a geological survey of a new and interesting region under United States authority. His philological studies have borne fruit in his 'Names and Places—Studies in Geographical and Topographical Nomenclature,' published in 1888, and in the more than four thousand definitions he furnished to the *Century Dictionary*. Mr. W. D. Whitney certainly had great ability in the study of natural science. Doubtless the accident of his finding various linguistic books ready to hand, at the time when his mental powers were most actively developing, had much to do with his turning in the direction of philology. During the summer which he spent with his brother on Lake Superior he had a Sanskrit grammar with him, which he studied at odd moments when not engaged in collecting plants or computing barometrical observations. Yale College has had another marked example of a scholar with equal ability and tastes for widely diverse studies, in Professor James Hadley, whose first published work was in the department of mathematics, and of whom a high authority said that the best

mathematician in the country was spoiled when Mr. Hadley devoted himself to Greek!

Mr. Whitney's practical banker father was not fully satisfied with his plan of giving himself to Oriental studies, and asked his pastor whether a man could support himself in life by studying and teaching Sanskrit. Dr. Day made the very wise answer that if a man had any exact and thorough knowledge, he was likely to be able to use it. As a Massachusetts man, the father turned naturally to Harvard as the proper place for his son's pursuit of advanced studies, but his pastor called his attention to the newly established department of Philosophy and the Arts at New Haven as the only definite arrangement yet made in this country for university work, and especially to the unique equipment of the special department of Oriental languages.

Before going to New Haven to study, Mr. Whitney prepared and published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* an article (translated and abridged from von Bohlen) on the 'Grammatical Structure of the Sanskrit'; and in the same periodical, in the following year, he published a 'Comparison of the Greek and Latin Verbs.'

In the autumn of 1849, too late for his name to appear in the catalogue of that year, Mr. Whitney came to Yale and studied through the remainder of the college year under Professor Salisbury. His associate in study was Professor James Hadley (six years older than himself, but only three years older in college age), who had been appointed assistant professor of Greek in 1848. The relations of the two continued most intimate and mutually stimulating until the death of Professor Hadley in 1872. Mr. Whitney edited a volume of Professor Hadley's Essays, in 1873, and wrote a brief but highly appreciative sketch of his friend for the large work entitled 'Yale College,' published in 1879.

Professor Salisbury was graduated at Yale in 1832. During more than three years' residence abroad, 1836-39, he studied with De Sacy and Garcin de Tassy in Paris and with Bopp in Berlin. In 1841 he was invited to a professorship of the Arabic and Sanskrit languages in Yale College, without the expectation of pecuniary compensation. This was only nine years after the foundation of the Sanskrit professorship (of H. H. Wilson) at Oxford, and twelve years after Lassen was made Professor Extraordinarius at Bonn. He returned to Europe in 1842 for a year, and read *privatissime* Arabic with Freytag and Sanskrit with Lassen, at Bonn. In 1846 he was made the Corresponding



Secretary of the American Oriental Society, and (to use Mr. Whitney's words) "for some ten years Professor Salisbury was virtually the Society, doing its work and paying its bills. He gave it standing and credit in the world of scholars, as an organization that could originate and make public valuable material; after such a start, it was sure of respectful attention to whatever it might do." The Society had published nothing before he took charge of this office. Professor Salisbury also secured valuable Arabic and Sanskrit manuscripts and books from De Sacy's library and elsewhere in Europe; and Professor FitzEdward Hall, then at Benares, procured for him many expensive and important Sanskrit publications from India. His services and generosity in procuring fonts of Oriental type, and his wisdom in bringing the Oriental Society into close connection with the studies of foreign missionaries, should not be forgotten. He was the only trained Orientalist in this country, until Mr. Whitney's return in 1853, and had an admirably equipped library. In the Yale catalogue of 1841-42, Professor Salisbury's name appears for the first time in the list of the faculty as Professor of the Arabic and Sanskrit Languages and Literature. In the catalogue of 1843-44, announcement is made that "the Professor of Arabic and Sanskrit will give instruction on Tuesdays and Wednesdays in Arabic grammar with the interpretation of the Korân and the Mo'allakas, and on Fridays and Saturdays in Sanskrit grammar with the interpretation of the laws of Manu." In the following year we are told that "the Professor of Arabic and Sanskrit proposes to commence this year, in the ensuing summer, a free course of lectures on the Sacred Code of the Hindus, the Manava Dharma Sastra." In 1845 for the first time appears a modestly-placed paragraph, saying "Instruction is also given by the Professors to Resident Graduates, provided a sufficient number present themselves to form a class." This was followed by the offer of a "course of lectures on the literary history and doctrines of the Kurân," or instruction in the elements of Sanskrit. In 1847 appeared the formal announcement of the opening of the Department of Philosophy and the Arts, with definite arrangements for advanced work. The philological courses were by President Woolsey (Thucydides or Pindar), Professor Kingsley ("in such Latin author as may be agreed upon"), Professor Gibbs ("lectures on some points of general Philology"), and Professor Salisbury (Arabic Grammar, and "some of the relations of the Arabic to other of the Shemitish dialects").

Marvellous stories are told in student-tradition of the rapid progress made by Mr. Whitney and Mr. Hadley—that they learned all the paradigms of Bopp's grammar in two lessons, etc. The basis of the stories is partly the fact that both already read simple Sanskrit with ease, but it is certain that few teachers ever had such a class. They were Professor Salisbury's first and last pupils in Sanskrit, but he might well feel proud of the record. He himself says of them that "their quickness of perception and unerring exactness of acquisition soon made it evident that the teacher and the taught must change places."

In 1850 Mr. Whitney went to Germany and spent three winter semesters in studying with Weber, Bopp, and Lepsius in Berlin, and two summer semesters at work with Roth in Tübingen. At the suggestion of Roth he undertook with this master the publication of the Atharva-Veda, and copied and collated the Berlin MSS of this work. In 1852 he sent to the American Oriental Society a paper, read at their October meeting of that year, on 'The main results of the later Vedic researches in Germany.' A letter from Weber, dated at Berlin, Dec. 28, 1852, is interesting in this connection on several accounts. He writes: "I hope ere long Sanskrit studies will flourish in America more than in England, where with the only exception of the venerable and not-to-be-praised-enough Professor Wilson nobody seems to care for them so much as to devote his life to them. The East India Company certainly does all that is in its power to help the publication of the Vedic texts, but it does not find English hands to achieve it. . . . It is certainly very discouraging to see that Professor Wilson during all the time since he got his professorship in Oxford, has not succeeded in bringing up even one Sanskrit scholar who might claim to be regarded as one who has done at least some little service to our Sanskrit philology. . . . I have to congratulate you most heartily on your countryman Mr. Whitney, who is now intensely engaged in the preparations for an edition of the Atharva Samhitā in union with Professor Roth of Tübingen. The next number of the *Indische Studien*, too, which is now in press, contains from him tables showing the natural relation of the four now known Samhitās of the Veda,—an attempt in which he was greatly indebted to Professor Roth's communications, but which still remains also a very favorable specimen of his own assiduity and correctness."

The following letters need little explanation. We note with interest how soon the first followed the receipt of Weber's letter

which has just been quoted. The spirit which prompted the offer of the first letter is certainly unusual in its generosity—not only surrendering a professorial chair, but also providing for its endowment. The modesty and delicacy of the reply seem as extraordinary at the present day, and were perhaps as rare forty years ago.

Under date of February 19, 1853, Professor Salisbury wrote to Mr. Whitney: "... I have observed your course of study and the rapidity of your acquisitions since you have been abroad with much interest and have seen in this, together with what I have known otherwise of your tastes and talents, a way opening for relief to myself which I have long desired. The prospect has been the more pleasing to me inasmuch as I have also seen that I might be able through you to bring new honor to my 'alma mater.' ... It is also much at heart with me to secure ... assistance to myself in editing and endeavouring in every way to improve the *Journal of the Oriental Society*." Professor Salisbury proposed that Mr. Whitney should be made "Professor of the Sanskrit and its relations to the kindred languages, and of Sanskrit literature, in the Department of Philosophy and the Arts in Yale College," his term of service to begin Aug. 8, 1853;—it being understood that Mr. Whitney would include in his instructions the teaching of modern languages to undergraduates, and should receive the fees which were then paid for such teaching. It was understood, further, that Mr. Whitney would co-operate with Professor Salisbury in editing the *Journal of the Oriental Society*. Professor Salisbury undertook to create a fund which with the fees for modern-language instruction might furnish nearly the ordinary salary of a Yale professor at that time.

Mr. Whitney replied from Paris, on April 4, 1853. Professor Salisbury's letter had reached him at Berlin at a time when he was engaged in closing his work there, and "had hardly an hour for quiet thought upon any subject." He expressed his gratitude for the kind feeling toward him "which has had a share in the dictating of the proposal," and continued: "Nor can I well say how much I am struck by the true and self-forgetting zeal for the progress of Oriental studies, of which this, like all your previous movements, affords an evidence. But ... I am compelled to ask myself whether ... I can hope to render any such service to Science as would be an adequate return for the kindness you exhibit toward me; whether, finally, it would not be in me an act

of unpardonable presumption to take upon my shoulders an office which you are desirous of throwing off. . . . I need not say how high and honorable a post I regard that of a teacher at Yale to be, how many and extreme attractions, both in a personal and in a scientific point of view, the prospect of such a situation would have for me. . . . So far as my own interests are concerned, I could find nothing in the terms which you propose or the duties which you suggest to which to raise a moment's objection. . . . All that I could bring up against the arrangement would be that the advantage is too entirely upon my side." He desired further time for reflection and consultation with his friends, and thought the postponement of a decision less objectionable because he did not expect to be able to finish his work in Europe and return before the last of August, and then, after a three years' absence from home, desired to spend some time with his friends. His eyes, too, had been giving him "during the winter ground for some apprehension," and "would doubtless be best consulted for by a period of rest and inaction."

In Paris he was "at work on a MS of the Atharva which belongs to the Imperial Library." "Probably it will cost me about six weeks' labor. . . . Then will follow two or three months of similar labor in London and Oxford. . . . During the whole winter I was compelled to neglect all other studies; that, however, chiefly owing to the condition of my eyes, which robbed me of about half my time. Persian and Arabic had to be laid aside altogether, and what of time and strength I had to spare from the Sanskrit, I devoted to the Egyptian and Coptic. I cannot well express to you the interest which this latter branch of study has awakened in me, and the strong desire I have felt to penetrate further into it than the mere surface exploration which could be made in the odd moments of a single winter. I would not, however, sell for a very large sum the little insight into this wonderful subject which I have already obtained, and it will be my highest pleasure to attempt to draw it somewhat more into the circle of our Oriental inquiries than has been generally the case hitherto. . . . There is nothing new of particular interest, so far as I know, to communicate to you from the Sanskrit world on this side of the water. The main interest attaches to the Lexicon which is going to be really a great work, and to push forward the whole study of that language a long way with one thrust. A slow thrust, unfortunately, it will have to be;

Prof. Roth estimates ten years as needed for its perfection. [It was completed in 1875.] I am going to contribute my small mite also toward it, by furnishing to Prof. Roth the vocabulary complete of the Atharva. The latter, as you perhaps know, has now the sole redaction of the Vedic material, Aufrecht having left Germany. The next number of Weber's *Zeitschrift* will be out now very soon, and will contain a contribution from me, a Vedic concordance."

Mr. Whitney reached home earlier than he had expected—about Aug. 8, 1853—and on Aug. 15 he wrote: "Although not less distrustful than before of my ability to discharge to your satisfaction and my own the duties of the post to which you would assign me, I should be disposed to accept gratefully your proposals, and do my best at least to accomplish that which such an acceptance demands of me." But Mr. Whitney desired a modification of the plan. "I have no such knowledge of French as would in any manner justify me in making pretensions to ability to teach it." His estimate of his knowledge of modern languages was lower than that of his friends. Not until 1856 did he accept the title of "Instructor in German." A year later, after he had taken nine months of travel and study in southern Europe, the college catalogue calls him "Professor of Sanskrit, and Instructor in modern languages."

The importance to American scholarship of the offer of this chair to Professor Whitney may be better appreciated if we remember that his predecessor still lives, and that no other chair of Sanskrit was established in this country for about a quarter of a century.

At a special meeting of the Corporation of Yale College, on May 10, 1854, the "Professorship of the Sanskrit and its relations to kindred languages, and Sanskrit Literature" was established, and Mr. Whitney was elected to hold it. The founder's desire for the range of the department was indicated distinctly, but the shorter name of the professorship, "Professor of Sanskrit," was used in the college catalogues until 1869, when the words "and Comparative Philology" were added, without indicating any change in the direction of the incumbent's studies or in the plan of the university.

In 1854 the announcement of philological courses in the Department of Philosophy and the Arts covered Professor Gibbs's lectures on general Philology, Professor Thacher's course of two



hours a week in Lucretius and in Latin Composition, Professor Hadley's course of two hours a week in Pindar or Theocritus, and contained the following statement: "Professor Whitney will give instruction in Sanskrit from Bopp's Grammar and Nalus, or such other text-books as may be agreed upon, and in the rudiments of the Ancient and Modern Persian, and of the Egyptian languages." The last clause here reminds the reader of the enthusiasm for the Egyptian and Coptic expressed in the letter of April 4, 1853; and of the fact that Mr. Whitney's first 'bibliographical notice' in the Journal of the Oriental Society discussed Lepsius's work on the 'First order of Egyptian deities,' but we read little more of these studies, except a paper on Lepsius's Nubian Grammar in the second volume of this JOURNAL. In 1858 Professor Whitney's announcement read: "Professor Whitney will instruct in the Sanskrit language, and in the History, Antiquities, and Literature of India and other Oriental countries; also in the comparative philology of the Indo-European languages, and the general principles of linguistic study. He will also give instruction to such as may desire it in the modern European languages."

The appointment of Professor Whitney in 1854 was for five years, with a pledge of reappointment "for life," five years later, if he desired it. In 1859 this reappointment was made—the founder of the chair stipulating that Professor Whitney should be free to retire from the professorship at any time. Mr. Whitney wrote, on July 15, 1859: "My present situation in New Haven is so pleasant to me on so many accounts, and holds out such prospects of honorable and useful employment in the time to come, that I should exceedingly regret being compelled to go elsewhere. Nor, although it would be in many respects more agreeable to me to be able to devote my *whole* time to my own peculiar studies, do I see reason seriously to regret the division of my labors between the ancient and the modern languages. It is both useful and pleasant to have to do more directly with the young men in college, and there is also the chance of influencing one and another of them to devote his attention to higher philological study."

During and after the Civil War, the ordinary expenses of life increased, and Mr. Whitney's family was growing. The income which had sufficed for the young and unmarried professor in 1854 had become entirely insufficient for his needs, with six

children, in 1870. For his pecuniary relief he assumed additional duties of instruction in modern languages, in connection with the Sheffield Scientific School. His teaching of modern languages in the academic department had ceased with the entrance upon his duties of Professor Coe, in 1867. The burden of instructing large classes of undergraduates in the very rudiments of French and German (each Academic student then having only thirty or forty lessons in each subject) became more and more irksome.

In September, 1869, Mr. Whitney received an urgent call to Harvard, very soon after President Eliot's election to the headship of that university, with the assurance that he should have "salary enough to constitute a tolerable support," and should not have to teach in any other than his own proper department. He wrote to a friend: "It is the most tempting offer that could, so far as I know, be made me; for on the one hand I have greatly grudged the time which I have had to steal from Oriental and linguistic studies for German and French; and, on the other hand, what I have received for my services to the College has not for a good while paid more than about half my expenses. . . . Such a state of things has been, of course, worrying enough, nor have I seen any definite prospect of a change. But I am greatly attached to the College here, and to the Scientific School, and to relatives and friends in New Haven, and have no hope that . . . I should become so wanted and so comfortable anywhere else."

Professor Whitney's colleagues saw how fatal his departure would be to the advanced philological work at Yale. No definite provision had then been made for graduate instruction in Greek, Latin, and Modern Languages, and although Professors Hadley, Thacher, Packard, and Coe were laboring to build up this department, their efforts received only the slightest pecuniary compensation; they were expected to do full work in the undergraduate department; Mr. Whitney was the only "University professor," not only at Yale, but in the whole country. One who is everywhere recognized as a leader in education then wrote: "I am confident that there is no one whose intellectual influence over the younger officers of the college is so great as Mr. Whitney's. . . . I have greatly admired his influence in promoting fidelity, truth, justice, and industry among the students, as well as his skill in promoting their intellectual character." Another of his colleagues wrote: "I have never known the college men so moved. The danger of losing so eminent a man as Mr. Whitney seemed almost

appalling, and I think if no other means of retaining him could be devised, the professors themselves would each cut off a slice <sup>there</sup> from ~~his~~ meagre salary to make up the amount necessary to retain him. The question seems to rise above personal considerations and to come very near to the vital interests of the university."

Professor Salisbury, whose insight and generosity had brought Mr. Whitney to Yale, was nearly concerned by the call to Cambridge, and after less than a week's delay provided the sum needed for the full foundation of Mr. Whitney's chair on the modern scale of salaries, which had changed greatly since 1854, and Mr. Whitney decided to remain in New Haven. At this time the arrangement was made that Mr. Whitney should give regular instruction in linguistics to the undergraduate classes of the college, and this course, at first given in the form of lectures, as part of the required work, was amplified and continued as an 'elective' until 1886. Mr. Whitney still continued to teach in the Scientific School for an hour a day, saying that in no other way could he add so easily a convenient thousand dollars a year to his income as by teaching from eight to nine o'clock each morning; he required no preparation for the exercise, it did not interfere with the work of his day, and he liked to be brought into contact with the young men.

The invitation to Harvard and the decision to remain at Yale had attracted considerable attention and had given rise to many plans for advanced philological instruction at New Haven. Mr. Whitney's release from drudgery with undergraduates enabled him also to enrich his Sanskrit and linguistic courses. In the catalogue of 1870-71 we read: "In Philology, a somewhat regular course of higher study, extending through two years, and leading to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, is offered. The leading studies of the first year will be The general principles of linguistic science, under Professor Whitney; the Sanskrit language, under Professor Whitney; the older Germanic languages, especially Gothic and Anglo-Saxon, under Professor Hadley and Mr. Lounsbury; along with higher instruction in the classical and the modern languages, according to the special requirements of each student, under Professors Thacher, Packard, and Coe, and Messrs. Van Name and Lounsbury, and others. The leading studies of the second year will be The comparative philology of the Indo-European languages . . . under Professor Whitney; the history of the English language, under Professor Hadley; along

with other special branches, as during the first year." The reward for the new enterprise of a formal graduate school of philology came almost immediately in the form of an unusual class of students, nearly all of whom were destined to secure honorable distinction in their chosen work. In the list of those who received the degree of Ph. D. in 1873 appear the names of Lanman of Harvard, Learned of the Japanese Doshisha, Luquiens of Yale, Manatt of Brown, Otis of the Institute of Technology, and Perrin of Yale. Truly an unusual group! Only the year before, Professor Easton of the University of Pennsylvania and Professor Beckwith of Trinity College, and the year following Professor Edgren of the University of Gothenburg, received the same degree, while soon after them President Harper of Chicago, Professor H. P. Wright of Yale, Professor Sherman of Nebraska, Professor Peters of the University of Pennsylvania, and Professor Tarbell of the University of Chicago completed the graduate course under Mr. Whitney. The service which the Semitic scholar, Professor George E. Day, had done for Indo-European philology by turning Professor Whitney's mind to its attractions, was in a way repaid by the latter when he pointed out to William Rainey Harper the great opportunity open to workers in the Semitic field; as a graduate student at Yale, Dr. Harper gave himself to work in the field of the Indo-European languages, but his recollection of his master's words has had a wide influence on Semitic studies in America. Professor Whitney was justly proud of his pupils, and was always interested in their work. His classes in Sanskrit were not large absolutely, but frequently he could say that more were studying this language with him than with any other university professor in the world.

Professor Whitney's connection with the Sheffield Scientific School was close. He organized its department of modern languages, and was a member of its 'Governing Board' from the time of the organization of that body in 1872. One who has occasion to know better than all others says that he was "a tower of strength" to the School—not only by his instructions and by inspiring the students with the spirit of true scholarship, but by his intelligent appreciation of the aims of the School and his wise judgment as to the means to be used in order to attain them. His personal liking for natural science, and training in its methods, added the warmest sympathy to his work in connection with this department of the University.

In the very first communication made to Mr. Whitney with regard to his work at Yale, attention was called to the opportunity for usefulness in connection with the American Oriental Society, of which he was elected a member in 1850. In 1854 his name appears in the list of the publication committee of that Society. In 1855 he was made librarian, and held that office until 1873. This latter post was no sinecure. In the winter of 1853-54, on going to visit the library (then kept in Boston), he "found it a pile of books on the floor in the corner of an upstairs room in the Athenaeum, apparently just as it had been brought in and dumped down from an earlier place of keeping." In the summer of 1855 the books were removed to New Haven. The task of "arranging, labelling, entering in the book of donations, and preparing cards" involved "a very considerable and tedious amount of work." In 1857, on Professor Salisbury's going abroad and resigning the office, Professor Whitney was elected Corresponding Secretary, and continued in this position until 1884, when he was elected President of the Society. His resignation of this latter office was not accepted until 1890, when for nearly four years the condition of his health had obliged him to absent himself from its meetings. He could well say that "no small part of his work had been done in the service of the Society"; from 1857 to 1885, "just a half of the contents of its Journal is from his pen." His care of the publications of others, also, was specially difficult, in view of the peculiar danger of typographical errors and the wide field covered by the papers; no ordinary proof-reader could render much assistance. And not infrequently articles by those who were unaccustomed to scientific composition needed thorough revision. On his positively declining to be a candidate for re-election as President, the Society adopted the following minute: "The American Oriental Society—regretfully accepting his declination—desires to record its deep sense of indebtedness to its retiring President, Professor William Dwight Whitney, of New Haven. For twenty-seven years he has served as Corresponding Secretary of the Society; for eighteen, as its Librarian; and for six, as its President. We gratefully acknowledge the obligation under which he has laid us by his diligent attendance at the meetings, by his unstinted giving of time and of labor in editing the publications and maintaining their high scientific character, by the quality and amount of his own contributions to the *Journal*—more than half of volumes VI-XII



coming from his pen—and above all by the inspiration of his example.”

The American Philological Association might have been a natural off-shoot from the Oriental Society. The latter has had a ‘classical-section’ since 1849, of which Professor Hadley was long at the head, of which Professor Goodwin has been the leader for nearly a quarter of a century; and classical papers had been presented by Professor Hadley, as that ‘On the theory of Greek accent,’ and by Professor Lane, as that ‘On the date of the Amphitruo of Plautus.’ Many of the early members of the Philological Association were also members of the Oriental Society. Mr. Whitney presided over the Philological Association at its first meeting in Poughkeepsie in 1869, and at the Rochester meeting in 1870, as retiring President, he delivered an address in which he sketched with great wisdom the Association’s action and work. “The association is to be just what its members shall make it, and will not bear much managing or mastering. It must discuss the subjects which are interesting American philologists, and with such wisdom and knowledge as these have at command. . . . In every such free and democratic body things are brought forward into public which might better have been kept back. . . . The classics, of course, will occupy the leading place; that department will be most strongly represented, and will least need fostering, while it will call for most careful criticism. The philology of the American aboriginal languages, on the other hand, demands, as it has already begun to receive, the most hearty encouragement. . . . Educational subjects also are closely bound up with philology, and will necessarily receive great attention; yet there should be a limit here; our special task is to advance the interests of philology only, confident that education will reap its share of the benefit.” Mr. Whitney’s services to the Association, and faithful attendance upon its meetings, may be estimated from the fact that the first sixteen volumes of the Transactions contain fourteen papers by him printed in full, while occasionally he presented communications which he did not care to print. At its meeting in Williamstown in July last, the Association adopted the following minute: “The American Philological Association, at its first meeting after the death of Professor William D. Whitney, bears grateful testimony to the value of the services which he rendered for the furtherance of philological learning, and especially in connection with this Association.

Fitly chosen to be its first President, and retained for a quarter of a century upon its Executive Committee, he never failed to take an active part in its work, and in many ways he advanced its interests and encouraged and assisted the studies to which its members are devoted. The record of his life-work may be left for more full recital at another time; but the Association takes this opportunity of testifying to its sense of obligation to Professor Whitney's manifold and successful labors, and of the great loss which his death has brought to its members and to philological students throughout the world."

Both the classical and the oriental philologists of the country have noted Mr. Whitney's constancy in attendance on their gatherings. In November, 1875, he apologized to the Oriental Society for his absence from the May meeting (caused by his visit to Europe in the interest of the edition of the Atharva-Veda), and added that it was his second absence in twenty-one years from a meeting of the Society! His devoted fidelity to the little Classical and Philological Society at Yale was just as marked. A quarter of a century ago, he with Professor Hadley and Professor Packard made that small gathering a deep source of inspiration. Many, if not most, of his learned papers were presented for discussion there. After the death of the lamented Professor Hadley, which gave a sudden check to the development of Yale's advanced courses in philology, Mr. Whitney was the mainstay of the Society, and his regular attendance and patient attention roused to best effort each who took part. Perhaps I ought to confess also that some of the younger instructors and graduate students shrank from presenting papers which might be compared with the finished scholar's elaborate productions. At these meetings his patience must have been sorely tried; much that was presented can have had but little interest for him; but his courtesy was unfailing. He gave without stint of his precious time to any undertaking which he believed to be doing, on the whole, useful philological work.

The first great work of Mr. Whitney's scholarship was the publication of the Atharva-Veda-Samhitā, undertaken in 1852 with Professor Roth. The first volume of 458 pages, royal octavo, was published in 1855-56. In connection with this, he prepared and published in Weber's *Indische Studien* (vol. IV, pp. 9-64) in 1857 an 'Alphabetisches Verzeichniss der Versanfänge der Atharva-Samhitā'; in the *Journal* of the American

Oriental Society in 1862 (vol. VII, pp. 333-616) the 'Atharva-Veda-Prātiṣākhya,' with text, translation and notes; in the same *Journal* in 1881 (vol. XII, pp. 1-383) an 'Index Verborum' to the published text of the Atharva-Veda. He made to the A. O. S. in April, 1892, an 'Announcement' as to a second volume of the Roth-Whitney edition of the Atharva-Veda. "The bulk of the work" of preparing notes, indexes, etc., "was to have fallen to Professor Roth, not only because the bulk of the work on the first volume had fallen to me [i. e. Professor Whitney], but also because his superior learning and ability pointed him out as the one to undertake it." But Roth's "absorption in the great labor of the Petersburg lexicon for a long series of years had kept his hands from the Atharva-Veda." Mr. Whitney said that he had never lost from view the completion of the plan of publication as originally formed. "In 1875 I spent the summer in Germany chiefly engaged in further collating at Munich and at Tübingen the additional manuscript material which had come to Europe since our text was printed; and I should probably have soon taken up the work seriously, save for having been engaged while in Germany to prepare a Sanskrit grammar, which fully occupied the leisure of several following years. At last in 1885-86, I had fairly started upon the execution of the plan when failure of health reduced my working capacity to a minimum, and rendered ultimate success very questionable. The task, however, has never been laid wholly aside, and it is now so far advanced that barring further loss of power, I may hope to finish it in a couple of years or so. The plan includes critical readings upon the text"; the readings of the Pāippalāda version; the data of the Anukramaṇī respecting authorship, divinity, and meter of each verse; references to the ancillary literature; extracts from the printed commentary; and, finally, a simple literal translation. "An introduction and indexes will give such further material as appears to be called for." Of this work the last revision is only partially made; a few months' more labor would have completed it; Professor Lanman, of Harvard, has undertaken to finish the revision and to conduct the volume through the press. Thus Professor Whitney's work closes as it began—with the Atharva-Veda.

Perhaps Mr. Whitney's most important service to Sanskrit philology was the preparation of his 'Sanskrit Grammar, including both the classical language, and the older dialects, of Veda and Brahmana,' 486 pp., octavo. This was published in Leipzig

in 1879, in the same year with a German translation. He undertook this work in 1875, and in 1878 went to Germany with his family and spent fifteen months in writing out the grammar and preparing it for the press. He aimed "to make a presentation of the facts of the language primarily as they show themselves in use in the literature, and only secondarily as they are laid down by the native grammarians"; "to include also in the presentation the forms and constructions of the older language, as exhibited in the Veda and Brāhmaṇa"; "to treat the language throughout as an accented one"; "to cast all statements, classifications, and so on, into a form consistent with the teachings of linguistic science." "While the treatment of the facts of the language has thus been made a historical one, within the limits of the language itself, I have not ventured to make it comparative, by bringing in the analogous forms and processes of other related languages. To do this, in addition to all that was attempted beside, would have extended the work both in content and in time of preparation, far beyond the limits assigned to it." A second edition, revised and extended, was published ten years later, in 1889. A 'Supplement to his Sanskrit Grammar: The Roots, Verb-forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language,' 250 pp., was published in Leipzig in 1885. That he did not discredit and slight the old Hindu grammarians because of any lack of acquaintance with them is shown by his own work and publications in that field. He published not only the Atharva-Veda-Prātiśākhya (text, translation and notes, in 1862), but also a similar edition of the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya, with its commentary, the Tribhāṣhyaratna, in 1871. The true relations of Hindu Grammar to the study of Sanskrit, he made clear in two articles published in the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, in vols. V and XIV. His last word on the subject was this: "I would by no means say anything to discourage the study of Pāṇini; it is highly important and extremely interesting and might well absorb more of the labor of the present generation of scholars than is given to it. But I would have it followed in a different spirit and a different method. It should be completely abandoned as the means by which we are to learn Sanskrit. For what the literature contains, the literature itself suffices; we can understand it and present it vastly better than Pāṇini could. It is the residuum of peculiar material involved in his grammar that we shall value, and the attempt must be made to separate that from the rest of the mass." More

than twenty-five years ago he called attention to the fact that the very title of Professor Goldstücker's paper 'On the Veda of the Hindus and the Veda of the "German School"' involved an evident *petitio principii*. The fair theme would have been 'The Veda of the Hindu Schools, and the Veda of the European School: which is the true Veda?'

The following extracts from a review by Hillebrandt in the fifth volume of *Bezenberger's Beiträge* illustrate the reception generally accorded to the Sanskrit Grammar:—"Es handelte sich für ihn nicht um ein tieferes studium der einheimischen indischen grammatik, auf deren reiche beobachtungen unsere bisherigen sanskritgrammatiken fast ausschliesslich sich stützen, sondern um die erforschung des sprachzustandes, wie ihn die litteratur selbst aufweist. . . . Whitney's eigentliche aufgabe war es, in die sanskritgrammatik die grundsätze der linguistik durchgreifender, als bisher geschehen war, einzuführen und die sprache als eine historisch gewordene zu betrachten. Dies princip hatte eine beständige rücksichtnahme auf den vedadialekt zur voraussetzung und verlieh Whitney's buche vorzüge, welche allein genügen würden, ihm eine hervorragende stellung unter den vorhandenen lehrbüchern anzuweisen. Die reiche fülle neuen materials, welches er . . . aus allen teilen der vedischen litteratur herbeizog und in instructiver weise dazu verwandte, über das allmähliche aufleben und absterben dieses oder jenes sprachgebrauchs aufschluss zu geben, die durch reiche beispiele und aufstellung ganzer paradigmien illustrierte unterscheidung vedischer und klassischer flexion, die von der indischen grammatik vernachlässigte statistische beobachtung des formenschatzes in älterer und jüngerer litteratur—dies sind eigenschaften die es in dieser ausdehnung mit keinem teilt."

The Grammar provided an instrument which all Sanskrit scholars are now thankfully using.

Of the Supplement to the Grammar, von Bradke wrote in the third volume of the *Literaturblatt für orientalische Philologie*: "So anspruchslos das Werk auftritt, in dieser Weise konnte es nur von einem unserer ersten Kenner der altindischen Literatursprache, und auch von einem solchen nicht ohne lange und mühevollen Arbeit geschaffen werden."

In this connection we should be again reminded that Professor Whitney was one of the chief four collaborators who furnished material for the great Sanskrit dictionary published at the expense of the Russian government.



In March, 1864, Mr. Whitney delivered at the Smithsonian Institution a series of six lectures on the Principles of Linguistic Science—probably lectures which he had given to the Sheffield Scientific School the preceding year. This course was repeated before the Lowell Institute and published in 1867, under the title of 'Language and the Study of Language,' 489 pages. This was translated into German by Jolly and into Netherlandish by Vinckers. The clearness and conciseness of the statements and the soundness of the views, in a field where the wildest vagaries had prevailed, and where the imagination was still allowed rather free play, were recognized on every hand. From the time of the preparation of those lectures, Mr. Whitney seems to have devoted to this subject more attention than he had given before. In 1875 he published in the International Scientific Series a similar book, in somewhat more compendious form, on the 'Life and Growth of Language: an outline of linguistic science,' 326 pages. This was translated into German, French, Italian, Netherlandish, and Swedish. This last book grew out of his lectures to academic senior classes.

No one has done so much as Mr. Whitney to teach sound views of linguistic science. Although the writer of this sketch has not ventured to include a detailed discussion of his views, perhaps mention may be made fitly of two points in which he was in advance of his contemporaries: he was among the very first to call attention to *analogy* as a force in the growth of language, and the first (after Latham in 1851) to doubt the then generally accepted view that Asia was the original home of the Indo-Europeans.

Papers which had been printed in the *North American Review* and other periodicals were collected and, with more or less revision, published in two volumes entitled 'Oriental and Linguistic Studies,' 1873-74, pp. 417 and 432. The first volume contained papers on the Veda, the Avesta, the science of language; the second, on the British in India, China and the Chinese, religion and mythology, orthography and phonology, Hindu astronomy. The author's regard for his earliest teacher in Sanskrit is marked by his dedication of the first of the two volumes to "Professor Edward Elbridge Salisbury, the pioneer and patron of Sanskrit studies in America." The second volume "is affectionately dedicated" to "Professors Rudolf Roth and Albrecht Weber, my early teachers and lifelong friends."

His long experience as a teacher of modern languages and as a student of linguistics aided to fit him pre-eminently for the preparation of grammars, readers, and vocabularies of French and German for schools and colleges, and his systematic habits of work enabled him to prepare these easily. This apparatus met the needs of the newly awakened interest in modern languages in this country, and has done much to further this interest. These books are said to be used more widely than any others of their kind in America. Some of them are published in two editions, full and abridged. His desire for a reasonable and truly philological study of the English language led him to prepare for use in schools 'Essentials of English Grammar' (1877, 260 pages), which has been adopted extensively by the public schools of the country and is declared, by one who knows, to have had great influence on the study of this subject.

Professor Whitney had assisted in the preparation of the Webster's dictionary of 1864, rewriting the definitions of many of the important words. This experience, his keen sense of proportion, his practical turn of mind, his precise and concise manner of statement, his wide and varied attainments,—all made him a peculiarly suitable person to be the editor-in-chief of the great Century Dictionary with which the people of this country will long associate his name. His unfortunate illness prevented him from revising the work so carefully as he doubtless would have done, had he been in vigorous health, and some have thought that he should be called supervising-editor rather than editor-in-chief. As the dictionary stands, he cannot be held responsible for details; but his influence upon the work was strong as well as salutary. Though he might not mark the proof for a dozen pages, he would score the next page in a manner which set a standard, and showed what he desired the revision of the rest to be, while the whole body of editors followed the general lines which he had drawn.

In the list of his writings which was drawn up by Professor Whitney in 1892, one hundred and forty-four items are enumerated; but numerous minor articles and book notices are not included, nor his contributions to the great Sanskrit, Webster, and Century dictionaries, nor his oversight of the German dictionary which goes by his name. He wrote articles for the New American Cyclopaedia, Johnson's Cyclopaedia, and the Encyclopaedia Britannica. He was a frequent contributor to the *Nation*

and other periodicals. In view of the importance and extent of many of his publications, his diligence and intellectual fertility are extraordinary.

As a teacher of advanced students, Mr. Whitney was exacting. A two-hour course under him in Sanskrit called for a larger outlay of time and effort than a four-hour course under most other teachers. He required precise knowledge of others as well as of himself. He was never deceived by glittering generalities, nor satisfied with approximate accuracy when absolute accuracy was attainable. He was modest, however, and while he would not allow the violation of well-established principles, yet in the translation of difficult and uncertain passages he never insisted on the pupil's adoption of his view.

In controversy and criticism, Mr. Whitney struck hard; his sword was piercing, even to the sundering of joint and marrow. But he was fair; he never misrepresented his opponent. He never lost his temper and struck blindly. He saw so clearly the absurdities and difficulties of a false position that he felt bound to present it as it was, yet without any thought of giving personal offence. For example, no one would suppose that he expected to offend his friend and teacher, Weber, by the remark that the latter had "unwittingly put himself in the position of one attempting to prove on philological grounds that the precessional movement of the equinoxes is from west to east, instead of from east to west" (Oct. 1865); but the criticism is very similar to that (which was counted severe) on Müller (July, 1876), that "even the aid of Main and Hinds could not keep him, in his astronomical reasonings, from assuming that, to any given observer, the ecliptic is identical with his own horizon."

The only prolonged controversy in which Professor Whitney was ever engaged was that with Professor Max Müller. His early relations with Müller had been pleasant, and he had supported the latter's candidacy for his chair at Oxford in 1860. His first public mention (1867) of Müller's work on the translation of the Vedas was very complimentary; but when the first volume of the translation appeared, his review of it was exceedingly severe. In the fourteenth volume of his *Indische Studien*, under the heading 'Zur Klarstellung,' Weber gives an account of the conflict. According to him, the real source of the controversy was Mr. Whitney's spirited reply to Müller's criticisms on the Böhrling-Roth Dictionary. "Whitney hatte zwei Vorles-

ungen Müller's kritisch besprochen,—scharf, wie es Whitney's Art ist, aber ohne irgend welche persönliche Wendung, so wie sich Gelehrte, denen es um ihre Meinung Ernst ist, zu streiten pflegen." The occasion of the contest was the publication by Professor George Darwin, in the *Contemporary Review* of November, 1874, of a report of Mr. Whitney's views. "Müller nahm sich denn auch gar nicht die Zeit Whitney's Abhandlung selbst zu lesen, sondern trat gleich in dem folgenden Januar-Heft der *Review* mit einer nur auf die Auszüge Mr. Darwin's basirten Gegenschrift hervor." Some have wondered that Mr. Whitney should care to follow up the matter so long, and even in 1892 should publish a brochure of 79 pages on 'Max Müller and the Science of Language: a Criticism.' But the question with him rose far above personalities: the truth was at stake. His mind, accurate by both nature and training, shrank from allowing inaccurate statements and false principles to be floated by a charming style. Great Britain in this generation has had more than one scholar of note whose brilliant form of statement, ingenious theories, and varied attainments have sufficed to give them undue authority on subjects where they made some grievous errors. Mr. Whitney felt that the higher a scholar's position, the greater his authority, the more careful he should be in all matters. He was heartily vexed by attempts to overlook and avoid the real point at issue. His vigorous spirit may have felt a certain enjoyment in a conflict; as an intellectual athlete he could appreciate the beauty of a keen thrust or the weight of a heavy blow; but while he did not fear a conflict, in some cases he avoided a controversy, even when he had been misunderstood and misrepresented.

No sketch of Mr. Whitney's character would be complete which did not mention his musical tastes. Music was always a source of pleasure and recreation to him. He had a fine tenor voice, and when a young man he was an acceptable and admired leader of the choir of Jonathan Edwards's old church in Northampton. The story is told that his conversations with the Rev. Dr. George E. Day, which led to his study of Sanskrit, were more frequent and natural because of his weekly calls at the pastor's house for the list of hymns to be sung. He was an active member of the Mendelssohn Society of New Haven a score of years ago, and did much to rouse the community to take interest in oratorios and other choral music, writing for the newspapers appreciative accounts of the works to be performed. He was

prominent in securing for New Haven concerts by the Boston Symphony Orchestra. One of the last occasions which brought him into a public gathering was a University Chamber Concert by the Kneisel Quartet. He was fond of singing hymns on Sunday evenings, and while he cherished some of the old tunes of his youth, he welcomed the introduction of the modern more ecclesiastical music. While singing the old hymns he was as fervent and orthodox as his Puritan ancestors.

Mr. Whitney was no recluse, nor a typical professor in manner. He attracted men to him and enjoyed being with them. He was not at all emotional, however, and cared little for general society. He gave a rather extreme view of himself in a letter written in 1869: "I am of a more than usually reserved and unsocial nature. I avoid society as much as I can, and am never quite comfortable in the company of any excepting those with whom I am most nearly bound. My besetting sin is burying myself in my books and papers, and too much overlooking all that is outside of them, —partly from natural tendencies, partly because I feel that in that way I shall on the whole do most good and give most pleasure to others." His bearing was perfectly simple and unpretentious —in short, that of a gentleman.

Like Aristotle's "magnanimous man," he gave little heed to praise or blame—not being elated or cast down by either. He loved learning for its own sake and not for its reward of fame. The words which he wrote with regard to his friend Professor James Hadley are strikingly true of himself: "No one was ever more free from the desire to shine among his fellows. His was a modesty entirely unfeigned, and free from every taint of a lower feeling. . . . He devoted himself so entirely to truth and virtue and duty, as he knew them, that there was left no room for any thought of self. He neither extolled himself nor gave way unduly to others." "He knew his power, but possessed it in the spirit of moderation and reserve." He was eminently guileless—though by no means a subject for imposition by others. He would have made an admirable lawyer or statesman, but he could not have been a politician. He saw truth clearly and abhorred anything like trickery or disingenuousness. He was also thoroughly sane. Sentimental enthusiasm never led him to denote as certain views which later were to be proved false. He had few scientific retractions to make in the course of forty-five years of publication. His statements on uncertain points were carefully guarded.



Where doubt existed, he was apt to feel it; in fact he was called in Germany "der Skeptiker der Sprachwissenschaft." His sanity restrained him from various excesses. His opinions on the desirability of reform in the spelling of the English language were clear and clearly expressed, and he was the first chairman of the committee appointed by the Philological Association for the furtherance of this reform in our country, but he saw so distinctly the difficulties in the way of an abrupt change, at least for the present, that he wasted no time in a Quixotic crusade. He was invited by the Japanese government to prepare an opinion in regard to the adoption of English as the official language of Japan—but he was not carried away by any sentimental notions of English as a *Weltsprache*. His mind was like a diamond, and his style was eminently clear and forcible. He never strove to be eloquent, but always expressed his thoughts in the fewest and simplest words. His was the style of a teacher rather than that of a popular platform-lecturer, but was enlivened by a strong sense of humor and by keen wit.

Professor Whitney's services to science and learning were freely recognized, both at home and abroad. He received the degree of Ph. D., *honoris causa*, from the University of Breslau in 1865; that of LL. D. from Williams College in 1868, from the College of William and Mary in 1869, from Harvard in 1876, and from the University of Edinburgh in 1889; that of J. U. D. from St. Andrews University in Scotland in 1874; that of L. H. D. from Columbia in 1887. He was a member of the National Academy of Sciences; an honorary member of the Oriental or Asiatic societies of Great Britain and Ireland, of Germany, of Bengal, of Japan, and of Peking; of the Literary Societies of Leyden, of Upsala, and of Helsingfors; fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh; member or correspondent of the Academies of Dublin, of Turin, of Rome (*Lincei*), of St. Petersburg, of Berlin, and of Denmark; also, correspondent of the Institute of France; and Foreign Knight of the Prussian order *pour le mérite* for Science and Arts, being elected May 31, 1881, to fill the vacancy made by the death of Thomas Carlyle.

In 1870 the Berlin Academy of Sciences voted him the first Bopp prize for his publication of the *Tāittiriya-Prāṭiśākhya*, as the chief contribution to Sanskrit philology during the preceding three years.

The following extracts from a brief article in the *Berliner*

*Nationalzeitung*, from the pen of Professor Albrecht Weber, form an interesting companion-piece to the letter from the same scholar, dated in December, 1852, which was quoted in the early part of this sketch: "Der jüngst in Yalecollege verstorbene Professor William Dwight Whitney war einer der ersten Indianisten und Sprachforscher der Gegenwart. Seine Sanskritstudien absolvirte er bei uns in Deutschland, hier in Berlin bei Weber und in Tübingen bei Roth. Beide Gelehrte betrachten es als einen ihrer schönsten Ehrentitel, ihn zum Schüler gehabt zu haben. Gleich seine erste Arbeit in den *Indischen Studien* . . . war ein Meisterwerk und zeigte alle die Eigenschaften, die seinen Arbeiten einen so hohen Werth verleihen sollten, Klarheit, Sorgsamkeit, und Akribie im kleinsten Detail. . . . Heimgekehrt nach Amerika, ward er der Begründer der dortigen, jetzt in reicher Blüthe stehenden Sanskrit-Philologie, die sich besonders durch die von ihm speziell betonte *statistische* Methode grosse Verdienste erworben hat, u. A. durch seine Schüler: Avery, Bloomfield, Hopkins, Lanman, Jackson, Oertel, Perry, Smyth, Snyder, trefflich vertreten wird. . . . Seine Uebersetzung eines der ältesten vorhandenen Lehrbücher der indischen Astronomie zeigte ihn als trefflichen Rechner und Astronom. Schärfe der Kritik, Klarheit der Darstellung, Genauigkeit der Arbeit sind allen seinen Werken als Stempel aufgedrückt. Sein reifstes Werk wohl ist seine 'Sanskrit-Grammatik,' . . . die erste *historische* Darstellung derselben, gewissermassen ein *gründliches* Résumé aus dem grossen Petersburger Sanskrit-Wörterbuch von Böhtlingk und Roth. Seine Arbeiten erstreckten sich im Uebrigen auf die verschiedensten Gebiete der Sprachwissenschaft. . . . Deutschland verliert in ihm einen der wärmsten Freunde, die es in Amerika hatte, Amerika einen seiner besten Gelehrten, und die Wissenschaft im grossen und ganzen einen ihrer ersten Koryphäen."

On August 28, 1856, Professor Whitney married Elizabeth Wooster Baldwin, daughter of the Hon. Roger Sherman Baldwin, of New Haven (ex-Governor of Connecticut and U. S. Senator), great-granddaughter of Roger Sherman, and great-great-granddaughter of President Thomas Clap, of Yale. Six children, three sons and three daughters, were born to them; of whom one son (the Hon. Edward B. Whitney, Assistant Attorney-General of the U. S.) and the three daughters survive. The daughters assisted their father in some of his later publications in the field of modern languages, and have done literary work of their own.

Just after a hard summer's work, at the very beginning of the college year in the autumn of 1886, Professor Whitney was prostrated by a severe disorder of the heart. For a time he was forbidden by his physician to do more than a minimum of work. He was obliged to avoid fatigue and excitement, and was limited strictly in his physical exercise. Those who had seen him return invigorated and exhilarated from a ten-miles' walk in the country were deeply pained to watch his slow, measured gait. He surprised many by his graceful submission to restrictions which he must have felt most keenly, and his household was still the brightest and most cheerful in the city. The gentler side of his nature became more prominent than before. His face grew more and more beautiful, with his white hair and beard, and delicate fair complexion. Though not an old man, he became truly venerable in appearance, and his presence was a real benediction to all whom he met. He was obliged to abandon entirely his work with undergraduate classes, but continued his classes in Sanskrit, receiving the students in his study at his home. During most of the past year he had six of these exercises each week. He did not abandon his other scholarly work. During the early years of this period of weakness, the *Century Dictionary* was going through the press and received his care. Every year witnessed his publication of some scientific paper or papers. He aided in the plans for the World's Congress of Philology, last year. One of his intimate associates, Professor Lounsbury, has written of him: "To me, at least, words seem inadequate to describe the quiet heroism which gave serenity and calm to his latter days, and the unflinching resolution with which he met and discharged every duty of a life over which the possibility of sudden death was always casting its shadow."

After an illness of about two weeks, Mr. Whitney passed away from this life, during sleep, on the morning of Thursday, June 7, 1894.

In the death of William Dwight Whitney, this country has lost one of her most distinguished men, one who had been recognized throughout the world as one of the highest authorities in his department of learning, and who had been for forty years the leader of oriental and linguistic studies in America and the personal master of a majority of the American scholars in his department. Yale University has lost one of her most brilliant and able scholars, one of her wisest and most faithful teachers,

whose influence always made for diligent and honest research and statement. His publications have had a lasting effect on scholarship. His personal influence will long endure. In the words of Professor Lanman, "for power of intellect, conjoined with purity of soul and absolute genuineness of character, we shall not soon look upon his like again."

THOMAS DAY SEYMOUR.

## II.—THE LATIN PROHIBITIVE.

### PART II.

In Part I of this paper I confined myself exclusively to prohibitions introduced by *ne*, *cave* and *noli*. That the clauses there discussed were *bona fide* cases of prohibition admitted of no doubt, with the exception of a few introduced by *ne* which might possibly be explained as dependent. Unfortunately, grammars are wont to classify under the same head, and with equal confidence, certain other forms of expression, many of which can be shown to belong to very different uses of the subjunctive mood. Most prominent among these are the instances of

#### *Neque (nec) with the Perfect (Aorist) Subjunctive.*

Before proceeding to discuss these clauses, let us get them all before us. As my statistics for this particular construction have, as far as the Augustan poets are concerned, been rather hurriedly gathered, I do not feel sure that my list contains all of the instances from those writers; but the few omissions, if there are any, could not affect the results reached. My statistics show that the following are the only instances of the construction to be found, from the earliest times down to the end of the Augustan period, which any one would ever think of explaining as prohibitions: Plaut. Capt. 149 Ego alienus? alienus ille? Ah, Hegio, numquam istuc dixis *neque animum induxis* tuom; Trin. 627 Sta ilico. Noli avorsari *neque te occultassis* mihi<sup>1</sup>;

Enn. Ann. 143 (Baehrens) nec mi aurum posco *nec* mi pretium *dederitis*;

Lucil. Sat. 30 (Baehrens 775) ———— “*neque* barbam *inmiseris* istam!”

Ter. And. 392 Hic reddes omnia, quae nunc sunt certa ei consilia, incerta ut sient, sine omni periclo: nam hoc haud dubiumst,

<sup>1</sup> The *videris* in Plaut. Mil. 573 (Ne tu hercle, si te di ament, linguam comprimes posthac: etiam illud quod scies nesciveris *nec videris* quod videris) is probably in the future perfect indicative (cf. the preceding *comprimes*). This use of the future perfect is very common in Plautus and Terence.



quin Chremes tibi non det gnatam. *Nec* tu ea causa *minueris* haec quae facis, ne is mutet suam sententiam; id. Haut. 976 Nemo accusat, Syre, te: *nec* tu aram tibi *nec* precatorem *pararis*;

Cic. Acad. 2, 46, 141 Nihil igitur me putatis moveri? Tam moveor quam tu, Luculle, *nec* me minus hominem quam te *putaveris*; id. Fin. 1, 7, 25 Quid tibi, Torquate, . . . quid tanta tot versuum memoria voluptatis adfert? *Nec* mihi illud *dixeris*: "Haec enim ipsa mihi sunt voluptati et erant illa Torquatis"; id. pro Sulla 8, 25 Aut igitur doceat Picentis solos non esse peregrinos aut gaudeat suo generi me meum non antepone. Quare *neque* tu me peregrinum posthac *dixeris*, ne gravius refutere, neque regem, ne derideare; id. Brutus 87, 298 nam de Crassi oratione sic existimo, ipsum fortasse melius potuisse scribere, alium, ut arbitror, neminem; *nec* in hoc ironiam *dixeris* esse, quod eam orationem mihi magistram fuisse dixerim; id. Rep. 6, 23, 25 Igitur alte spectare si voles atque hanc sedem et aeternam domum contueri, *neque* te sermonibus volgi *dederis nec* in praemiis humanis spem *posueris* rerum tuarum; id. ad Att. 12, 23, 3 Si nihil conficietur de Transtiberinis, habet in Ostiensi Cotta celeberrimo loco, sed pusillum loci, ad hanc rem tamen plus etiam quam satis: id velim cogites. *Nec* tamen ista pretia hortorum *pertimueris*. Nec mihi iam argento nec veste opus est nec quibusdam amoenis locis; id. ib. 13, 22, 5 Alteris iam litteris nihil ad me de Attica; sed id quidem in optima spe pono: illud accuso, non te, sed illam, ne salutem quidem. At tu et illi et Piliae plurimam, *nec* me tamen irasci *indicaris*; id. ad Att. 15, 27, 3 Quod me de Bacchide, de statuarum coronis certiore fecisti, valde gratum, *nec* quicquam posthac non modo tantum, sed ne tantulum quidem *praeterieris*; id. ad fam. 1, 9, 19 . . . recordare enim, quibus laudationem ex ultimis terris miseris. *Nec* hoc *pertimueris*; nam a me ipso laudantur et laudabuntur idem; id. ad Att. 10, 18, 2 Tu tamen perge quaeso scribere *nec* meas litteras *expectaris*, nisi cum quo opto pervenerimus, aut si quid ex cursu;

Hor. Od. 1, 11, 3 Tu ne quaesieris quem mihi, quem tibi finem di dederint, Leuconoe, *nec* Babylonios *temptaris* numeros; id. Sat. 1, 4, 41 Primum ego me illorum dederim quibus esse poetas excerpam numero: *neque* enim concludere versum *dixeris* esse satis; neque si qui scribat, uti nos, sermoni propiora, putes hunc esse poetam (cf. *dederim*, vs. 39);

Verg. Ecl. 8, 102 Fer cineres, Amarylli, foras rivoque fluenti transque caput iace, *nec respexeris*;

Ovid, Am. 2, 2, 25 . . . ne te mora longa fatiget, inposita gremio stertere fronte potes. *Nec* tu . . . *quaesieris*; id. H. 8, 23 . . . nupta foret Paridi mater, ut ante fuit. *Nec* tu *pararis* etc.; id. Epist. 19, 151 Si nescis, dominum res habet ista suum. *Nec* mihi *credideris*; id. Ar. Am. 1, 733 Arguat et macies animum. *Nec* . . . *putaris* etc.; id. ib. 2, 391 Gloria peccati nulla petenda sui est. *Nec* *dederis* etc.; id. ib. 3, 685 Sed te . . . moderate iniuria turbet, nec sis audita pellice mentis inops. *Nec* cito *credideris* etc.; id. Met. 12, 455 Memini et venabula condi inguine Nesseis manibus coniecta Cymeli. *Nec* tu *credideris* etc.; id. Trist. 5, 14, 43 Non ex difficili fama petenda tibi est. *Nec* te *credideris* etc.; id. ex Pont. 1, 8, 29 Ut careo vobis, Scythicas detrusus in oras, quattuor autumnos Pleias orta facit. *Nec* tu *credideris* etc.; id. ib. 4, 10, 21 Hos ego, qui patriae faciant obliviam, sucos parte meae vitae, si modo dentur, emam! *Nec* tu *contuleris* urbem Laestrygonis etc.; id. Fasti 6, 807 Par animo quoque forma suo respondet in illa, et genus et facies ingeniumque simul. *Nec* quod laudamus formam tu turpe *putaris*;

Tibull. 2, 2, 13 Iam reor hoc ipsos edidicisse deos. *Nec* tibi *malueris* etc.; id. 4, 1, 7 Est nobis voluisse satis, *nec* munera parva *respueris*;

Propert. 3, 13 (20), 33 (Müller) . . . tumque ego Sisyphio saxa labore geram. *Nec* tu supplicibus me *sis venerata* tabellis; id. 3, 28, 33 . . . cur reus unus agor? *Nec* tu virginibus reverentia *moveris* ora;

Livy 5, 53, 3 ego contra—*nec* id *mirati sitis*, priusquam quale sit audieritis—etiam si tum migrandum fuisset incolumi tota urbe, nunc has ruinas relinquendas non censerem; id. 21, 43, 11 . . . "hic dignam mercedem emeritis stipendiis dabit." *Nec* quam magni nominis bellum est, tam difficilem *existimaritis* victoriam fore; id. 23, 3, 3 Clausos omnis in curiam accipite, solos, inermis. *Nec* quicquam raptim aut forte temere *egeritis*; 29, 18, 9 Quibus, per vos fidem vestram, patres conscripti, priusquam eorum scelus expietis, *neque* in Italia *neque* in Africa quicquam rei *gesseritis*, ne . . . luant.

I have included the instances of this use from Early Latin in the above list, for the sake of completeness and for the purpose of facilitating comparison with what I have to say regarding the construction in classical times; for the following remarks will be chiefly concerned with classical prose. It will be observed that there are twelve instances of this use in Cicero—five of them

outside of his Letters. It seems to have been taken for granted that these are examples of the same construction as that in the prohibitive *ne feceris*. Grammars cite them side by side with the last-mentioned construction, often without so much as a comment. See, e. g., Madvig, 459, obs.; Roby, 1602; Gildersleeve, 266, rem. 1; Draeger, Hist. Synt., §149 B b (p. 313); Allen and Greenough, 266 b; Riemann, Syntaxe latine (Paris, 1890), p. 483; Schmalz-Landgraf in Reisig's Lat. Vorlesungen, p. 482; Schmalz, Lat. Synt., §31; Kühner, Ausführl. Gram. d. lat. Sprache, II, §§47, 9; 48, 3; 48, 4; etc., etc. And still they bear upon their face a suspicious look. What is *nec* doing in such a very pronounced and direct expression of the will in Cicero? Apart from these particular expressions, all grammarians agree that *neque* (*nec*), in the sense of *neve* (*neu*), is extremely rare in classical prose. I shall presently try to show that it does not occur at all in any volitive expression outside of poetry until the beginning of the period of decline, with the possible exception of one instance in Nepos. And still the grammars, even the most recent of them, would give us to understand that Cicero (of all writers!), in adding a prohibition in the perfect subjunctive, invariably, except in one passage, uses *neque* (*nec*). *Neve* (*neu*) with the perfect subjunctive occurs only once in Cicero in a prohibition. And we are asked to believe that *neque* (*nec*) occurs twelve times! Let us see whether such a state of things really exists.

Evidently our best starting-point in attempting to discover to what extent *neque* (*nec*) was used in prohibitions will be found in expressions whose prohibitive character is beyond all question, viz. expressions in which the verb is in the imperative, or, if in the subjunctive, is preceded by another verb which itself is introduced by *ne* or *neve*. The use of *ne* or *neve* will show beyond all possibility of doubt that the mood of the verb is volitive in character. Without the presence of such a *ne* or *neve*, one may often claim the right at least to doubt any one's interpretation of the mood of a given verb as volitive in meaning. For instance, when Cicero says (Ac. 2, 46, 141) . . . tam moveor quam tu, Luculle, *nec* me minus hominem quam te *putaveris*, there is nothing to show that *nec* . . . *putaveris* does not mean 'nor would you for a moment suppose that I am less human than you.' But, if we had such a sentence as *ne* . . . *dixeris*, *nec putaveris*, we could hardly escape the conclusion that *nec putaveris* must be in the same construction as *ne dixeris*.

What is to be said, then, of the use of *neque* (*nec*) with the imperative prior to the period of Cicero, in whom the passages under discussion are found? Merely this, that it does not once occur in any production, whether prose or poetry, of the whole ante-Ciceronian period. In the same period *neve* (*neu*) with the imperative occurs 121 times. These instances are nearly all in the laws, i. e. in prose: Corpus Inscriptionum Lat. I 28 (three times); 197 (eight times); 198 (twelve times); 199 (three times); 200 (thirty-four times); 204 (five times); 205 (three times); 206 (forty-five times); 207 (once); 576 (twice); 1409 (twice). Other instances are XII Tabulae, X 1 *ne . . . neve urito*; Plaut. Stich. 20 *ne lacruma neu face*; Cato, de agri cult. 144, 1 *neve facito*. Sometimes the *ne* is repeated: Ter. Heaut. 84 and 85 *ne retice, ne verere*. An examination of the Ciceronian period discloses the same condition of things, except that there does seem to be one clear instance of this use of *nec* in Catullus 8, 10.<sup>1</sup> It still remains very rare during the first half of the Augustan period. Horace has it once, Od. 2, 7, 19. Possibly there are two other instances in Horace, viz. Od. 1, 9, 15 *Quem fors dierum cumque dabit, lucro adpone nec dulces amores sperne, puer, neque tu choreas*, though here it might be said that the negatives connect merely the substantives, and the negative idea for the verb is allowed to take care of itself; and Od. 3, 7, 29 *Prima nocte domum claude neque in vias sub cantu querulae despice*. In this last passage it may be that it is not so much the idea of *despice* that is negated as that of *in vias*. There is no objection to the act of looking down, but it must not be *in vias*. This use is also very rare in Vergil, though *neve* with the imperative is very common in his writings. By the time, however, of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid, the old distinction between *neque* (*nec*) and

<sup>1</sup> The following instances must not be confused with this use: Cic. ad Att. 12, 22, 3 *Habe tuum negotium, nec quid res mea familiaris postulet sed quid velim existima*; id. Leg. 3, 4, 11 *Qui agent auspicia servanto, auguri publico parento, promulgata, proposita, in aerario cognita agunto, nec plus quam de singulis rebus semul consulunto, rem populum docento etc. . . . Censores fidem legum custodiunto; privati ad eos acta referunto nec eo magis lege liberi sunt*. In the first of these passages the idea of the verb is not negated at all. The meaning is 'Think, not this, but that.' In the second passage, similarly, the negative spends its force upon *plus quam* etc., and the meaning is 'they are to consult not more than once.' In the third case, likewise, the meaning is 'and not on this account (whatever other grounds there may be) are they to be free,' etc. Only the first of these passages gives us the words of Cicero, the others being quotations made by him from laws.

*neve* (*neu*) had broken down, and the one was used about as freely as the other with the imperative. But from first to last the use remained a poetical license.<sup>1</sup>

The above facts in themselves are enough to prejudice us very decidedly against explaining any *neque* (*nec*) in Cicero as introducing a prohibition. But let us now turn to *neque* (*nec*) used in prohibitions expressed by the subjunctive. As before pointed out, we can be sure that the subjunctive in such cases is hortatory in character only when *ne* or *neve* (*neu*) has preceded. How often, then, does *neque* (*nec*) occur in such clearly prohibitive uses of the subjunctive mood? Not once in prose from the earliest times till after the Augustan period, and only once in direct address in poetry,<sup>2</sup> Horace being again the poet who first ventures to make the innovation (Od. 1, 11, 2).<sup>3</sup> When a writer wishes to add a second prohibition to one already introduced by *ne*, or *neve*, he does so sometimes by *neu*: Plaut. Merc. 396 *ne duas neu dixeris*; id. Poen. 18 ff. *ne sedeant, neu multiant, neu obambulet, neu ducat*; id. ib. 30 *Ne sitiant neve obvagiant*; id. 38 *ne detur neve extrudantur*; Cato, de agri cult. 5, 4; ib. 38; ib. 83; ib. 143; Cic. Ac. 2, 40, 125 *ne asciveris neve fueris* adensus; etc.; sometimes by *aut*: Plaut. Curc. 539 *Ne facias aut censeas*; Ter. Eun. 14 *Ne frustretur aut cogitet*; sometimes by the repetition of *ne*: Ter. Haut. 85 *ne retice, ne verere*; Cato, de agri cult. 5, 2.

\* Now, with all this evidence before him, one should hesitate long before explaining any *neque* (*nec*) in Cicero as used with a volitive subjunctive. All other possible interpretations should be tested first. Now let us turn to the passages from Cicero which have prompted these remarks. There are twelve instances in Cicero of *neque* (*nec*) with the perfect subjunctive, which have been

<sup>1</sup> In Livy 22, 10, 5 *Si id moritur, quod fieri oportebit, profanum esto, neque scelus esto*, the meaning may be 'and it shall be no *scelus*.'

<sup>2</sup> Capt. 437 *Ne tu me ignores tuque te pro libero esse ducas, pignus deseras, neque des operam pro me ut huius reducem facias filium* must not be mistaken as illustrating this use. If *neque* here introduced a prohibition, the meaning would be 'and do not give,' which would be the direct opposite of the meaning intended. The *ne* at the beginning forms the prohibition with *des*, as with *ignores*, *ducas* and *deseras*, and the negative of *neque* merely reverses the meaning of the word *des*. The meaning is 'and do not not give,' i. e. 'and do not fail to give,' = *et ne non des*.

<sup>3</sup> With the third person it seems to occur at rare intervals as a poetic license, e. g. Catullus 61, 126.



looked upon as prohibitions. In not one of them has anything preceded that even suggested a prohibition. Most of them are preceded by simple assertions, or questions, in the indicative mood. In those cases where a subjunctive has preceded, the *nec* begins an entirely new sentence, so loosely connected with the preceding that editors separate the two sentences with a period. A striking proof that this use of the perfect subjunctive with *nec* is a construction entirely distinct from that of *ne* with the same mood and tense is found in the fact that certain writers who never use the latter at all are wont to make frequent use of the former. *Ne* with the perfect subjunctive is, for instance, entirely foreign to Ovid, but that poet, as will be seen by consulting the citations given above, uses *nec* with the same mood and tense, in sentences exactly similar in every way to those in Cicero, at least eleven times. The same condition of things exists in Vergil, Tibullus and Propertius, none of these authors making any use whatever of *ne* with the perfect subjunctive, whereas they present repeated instances of *nec* with that mood and tense. Again, this construction is found in the Orations of Cicero, where *ne* with the perfect is never used except once in a quotation, pro Sulla 8, 25; cf. also Verr. 2, 1, 54, 141. But there is other evidence perhaps even more striking than this. It will be remembered that we found, prior to the beginning of the period of decline, only two or three instances of verbs denoting merely mental activity used in prohibitions expressed by *ne* and the perfect subjunctive; while in all other sorts of prohibition such verbs were found in large numbers. We found conclusive proof that this form of prohibition was felt to be unsuited to expressing such mild prohibitions as 'do not think,' 'do not believe,' etc. Refer now to the list above given of *nec* with the perfect subjunctive. Out of the 38 instances there given of this use—a decidedly smaller number than exist of *ne* with the perfect in the same period—15 are of just the sort of verbs that are so uniformly absent from prohibitions expressed by *ne* with that tense. Surely all this looks as though we are on altogether different ground. We shall find later on that the fact that so many verbs denoting mental activity are found with this use of *nec* forms as strong an argument in favor of assigning the use to a certain other class of constructions as it forms against classifying it in the usual way.

There now remains, so far as I can see, only one possible argument which those can use who still prefer the common

interpretation of these clauses. It is claimed by our Latin grammars that *neque* (*nec*) is occasionally used in Cicero in other sorts of volitive clauses where it is equivalent to *neve* (*neu*). No less an authority than Schmalz (Revision of Krebs' Antibarbarus, II, p. 121; Revision of Reisig's Vorlesungen, p. 482) expresses this view in very distinct terms. Now, some one may say, if Cicero uses *neque* (*nec*) at all in expressions of the will, as in purpose clauses, there is no reason why he should not use it in any volitive expression. Even if the premises were true, this would hardly seem a fair conclusion to draw from them, but I venture to dispute the premises and to claim that *neque* (*nec*) is never used by Cicero to negative the subjunctive in purpose clauses, or in any other volitive clauses. The proof of this is given by Schmalz's own statistics, and it is surprising that he did not see it.

Before taking up the passages that have been supposed to contain examples of *neque* (*nec*) in volitive clauses, it will be well to remind ourselves of certain facts which must be kept constantly in mind. The most important of these facts is this: that every purpose clause is, at the same time, a result clause as well. When a man says: 'I wish to train my children properly, that they may, in after years, be honored citizens,' their being honored citizens is, to be sure, the purpose of his training, but it may also be conceived of merely as the future result of that training. The use of the word 'that' instead of 'so that,' and 'may' instead of 'will,' shows that in this particular instance the purpose idea is probably uppermost in the mind of the speaker. Suppose now he says: 'I wish to train my children properly, *so that* (i. e. to train them in such a way that) they *will*, in after years, be honored citizens.' The two sentences practically mean the same thing, and one might at any time be substituted for the other; but in the second the substitution of 'so that' and 'will' shows that the feeling uppermost in the mind is that of result. In cases of this sort the mind may be fixed upon what will be the result of the action, and the idea of purpose that is implied may be left to take care of itself. Now, the Latin language is not fortunate enough, except in negative clauses, to have separate mechanisms in such cases to make clear the predominant feeling. The Latin would express the two ideas 'in order that they may' and 'so that (with the result that) they will' in exactly the same way. It accordingly very frequently happens

that it is impossible to determine whether a clause introduced by *ut* is to be classed as a purpose clause or a result clause. Such, for instance, are the following sentences: . . . *omni contentione pugnatum est, uti lis haec capitis aestimaretur* (Cic. Cluent. 41, 116); *Conscios interfecit ut suum scelus celaretur* ('that his crime might be concealed' or 'so that his crime was concealed'); . . . *exarsit dolor. Urgere illi, ut loco nos moverent; factus est a nostris impetus*; etc. It is true that what precedes an *ut*-clause commonly shows whether the coming *ut*-clause is to be felt as a purpose clause or a result clause; but it is also true that it very frequently does not. More than that: it often happens (and this is of especial importance in this connection) that what precedes would lead one to expect that a result clause is to follow, when a final clause, or some other kind of volitive clause, actually does follow. Such a sentence is found, for instance, in Ter. Phorm. 975 *Hisce ego illam dictis ita tibi incensam dabo, ut ne restinguas, lacrimis si extillaveris*. The expression *ita tibi incensam dabo* ('I will render her so enraged at you') might lead one to expect the thought to be completed by a clause of result, viz. *ut non restinguas* etc. = 'that you will not appease her anger, if you cry your eyes out.' Instead of that, the thought is shifted, and the sentence is completed, as the *ne* clearly shows, by an expression of the will. The meaning of the passage then is: 'I will make her so enraged at you, that you *shall* not ('shall,' instead of 'will,' denoting determination rather than mere futurity) appease her anger,' etc.<sup>1</sup>

Such expressions of determination, purpose and the like, where a result clause might commonly be expected, are not at all infrequent. Such a shifting of feeling cannot, of course, be detected when the subordinate clause is affirmative; but where that clause is negated, the choice between the negatives *ne* and *non* will show, beyond all question, the predominant feeling of the clause. I have made no attempt to collect passages illustrating this particular point, but Brix has made a collection of such passages

<sup>1</sup> I should not deem it necessary to stop to interpret the *ne* in this and similar passages, had not so distinguished a scholar as Brix, in my opinion, wholly misunderstood it. Misled by preconceived notions as to what ought to follow such expressions as *ita tibi incensam dabo*, he makes the statement (ad Plaut. Mil. 149) that *ne* and *ut ne* are sometimes used "nicht nur in Final-, sondern auch in Consecutivsätzen."

from Plautus and Terence in his note on Plaut. Mil. Gl. 149.<sup>1</sup> In any one of these passages, all of which are cited and discussed in my note appended below, *ut non*, instead of *ne* or *ut ne*, would be perfectly possible and would, in fact, have been expected, but the use of *ne*, or *ut ne*, shows that the contents of the *ut*-clause were looked upon not primarily as a result of anything, but rather as

<sup>1</sup> Brix cites the passages as illustrations of the consecutive use of *ne* and *ut ne*, but it will be noticed that in each case the *ne*, or the *ut ne*, may, without violence, and in fact without the least difficulty, be interpreted as involving in some form a distinct expression of the will; and, if this is the case, surely there can be no possible excuse for explaining it differently. Here are the passages, in the order in which Brix gives them: Mil. Gl. 149 . . . eum ita faciemus *ut*, quod viderit, *ne viderit*, 'will manage him so that he *shall not* have seen, i. e. shall not think that he has seen,' etc. ('shall not,' instead of 'will not,' implying that the act is willed by the subject of *faciemus*); id. Capt. 738 Atque hunc me velle dicite ita curarier, *ne* qui deterius huic *sit* quam quoi pessumest; id. Most. 377 Satin' habes, si ego advenientem ita patrem faciam tuom, non modo *ne* intro eat, verum etiam ut fugiat longe ab aedibus? id. Bacch. 224 Adveniat quando volt atque ita *ne sit* morae; id. Capt. 267 *ne* id quidem involucris inicere voluit, vestem *ut ne inquinat*; id. Men. 1100 Promerui *ut ne* quid ores, quod velis quin impetres; id. Trin. 105 Est atque non est mihi in manu, Megaronides: quin dicant, non est: merito *ut ne dicant*, id est; id. Mil. Gl. 726 Ita me di deaque ament, aequom fuit deos paravisse, uno exemplo *ne* omnes vitam *viverent*; Ter. Hec. 839 Ad pol me fecisse arbitror, *ne* id merito mihi *eveniret*. It is true that in the instances, cited by Brix, of *potin ut ne*, the introduction of a volitive feeling is somewhat surprising, but such a turn of the thought is perfectly intelligible and offers not the slightest excuse for supposing that *ne* is here used in the sense of *non*. (That such a use did once exist admits of no doubt [cf. *ne . . . quidem, ne-scio* etc.], but reminiscences of this use are not found in cases like those under discussion.) In Men. 606 Potin *ut* mihi molestus *ne sis*, there is a fusing together of two expressions; Potesne? mihi molestus *ne sis*! The feeling that prompts the speaker's words here may be expressed by 'Cease your annoyance, can't you?' We might put these same words into the form of a question pure and simple: 'Can't you cease your annoyance?' and if they were uttered with the proper emphasis and tone, the hearer would understand them at once as a command, and not at all as a question asking for information. In cases like the above, then, the choice of *ne* instead of *non* is determined by the feeling of the speaker, without regard to the grammatical form in which the sentence is cast. A similar phenomenon is found in the use of *quin*. This word really means 'why not?' and should, strictly speaking, take the indicative, as in Ter. Heaut. 832 Quin accipis? But 'why don't you take it?' under certain circumstances is felt as really meaning 'take it!', and in such cases *quin* is frequently found with the imperative, as in Ter. And. 45 Quin tu dic, regardless of the fact that *quin* is, or was, an interrogative. Similar phenomena are found also in Greek, where we find μή or μήδ' used even with the future indicative in

an expression of somebody's will. The idea of result is in most cases present, but the mind is fixed primarily upon the idea of will that accompanies it. Clauses similar to those cited from Plautus and Terence are not uncommon in the best classical prose and poetry, as will be seen by consulting Draeger's *Hist. Synt.* II, §410.

Now, if volitive clauses are so common where result clauses might be expected, we should not be greatly surprised if result clauses are occasionally found where purpose clauses might be expected, especially since the ideas of purpose and result are, confessedly, so closely associated. And it is the failure to recognize this fact that has led grammarians to assert that *neque* (*nec*) is occasionally used in final clauses. As intimated above, the latest champions of the view that this use is found in Cicero are Schmalz and Landgraf, who express it in their revision of Reisig's *Vorlesungen*, p. 482. But they greatly damage their own side of the question by certain concessions which they make. They even lay stress upon the fact that *neque* (*nec*) is never used in a clause introduced by *ne*, *neve* (*neu*) being the invariable word in such cases. Again, in Schmalz's revision of Krebs' *Antibarbarus* he says: "An dieser Regel, dass *nec* nie bei Cicero zur Fortsetzung von *ne* dient, muss unbedingt festgehalten.' This is true, despite the bare assertion of Draeger in his *Hist. Synt.*, §543, 7. Schmalz might have made his statement even more sweeping and said that such a use of *neque* (*nec*) does not occur anywhere in the best classical prose. With the exception of one passage in Nepos (Pausanias 4, 6), it remains a strictly poetical license, and extremely rare besides, until the time of Livy. Now, side by side with this fact, let us put certain other facts to which reference has

---

questions which imply a prohibition, e. g. Soph. Tr. 1183 Οὐ θάσσον οἴσεις μὴδ' ἀπιστήσεις ἐμοί 'will you not extend your hand and not distrust me?' This question implies a prohibition, 'extend your hand and *do not distrust me*,' and the fact that the speaker felt it as such accounts for his using *μὴδέ* instead of *οὐδέ*, which the future indicative would otherwise call for (cf. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, §299). Such a shifting of the thought inside of a sentence would of course be more common in colloquial language than in dignified styles. It is seen again in Persa 286 Potin ut molestus *ne sis*? In Pseud. 636 Potest ut alii ita arbitrentur et ego *ut ne credam* tibi, the feeling must be 'It is possible that others think so (that you are honest) and that I nevertheless *am not to trust* you,' implying that, from some source or other, he has received the warning *ne credas* 'Do not trust him.' This warning would, from his own point of view, become *ne credam* 'I am not to trust you,' in which, of course, the volitive feeling would still remain.



been made. We found that the clauses now under discussion are really known to be primarily volitive in character only when they are introduced, or accompanied, by *ne* or *neve*. But clauses thus introduced, or accompanied, by *ne* or *neve*, in spite of the fact that they occur everywhere very frequently, present not a single instance, in the best prose, of a second verb added by *neque* (*nec*), such verbs being invariably added by *neve* (*neu*). Is not the inference clear? The few *ut*-clauses continued by *neque* (*nec*) that have been supposed to be purpose clauses are to be interpreted as laying stress rather upon the result idea. Let us apply the interpretation I have suggested to the clauses in question, bearing constantly in mind the serious objection I have pointed out to the common interpretation:

Cic. ad fam. 9, 2, 3 Ac mihi quidem iam pridem venit in mentem bellum esse aliquo exire, ut ea quae agebantur hic quaeque dicebantur, *nec viderem nec audirem*, i. e. 'to escape to some place where I should no longer see, or hear,' etc. ('the result of which flight would be that I,' etc.);

in Caecil. 16, 52 qui si te recte monere volet, suadebit tibi ut hinc discedas *neque* mihi verbum ullum respondeas, i. e. 'will advise you in such a way as to result in your departing without saying a word in reply';

Verr. II 2, 17, 41 Illi eum commonefaciunt ut utatur instituto suo *nec cogat* ante horam decimam de absente secundum praesentem iudicare; impetrant, i. e. 'they earnestly plead with him, with the result that he follows his usual custom and does not compel, etc.; they thus win their point';

de off. 2, 21, 73 In primis autem videndum erit ei, qui rem publicam administrabit, ut suum quisque teneat *neque* de bonis privatorum publice *deminutio fiat*, i. e. 'he will have to see to it and bring about the result that,' etc.;

de off. 1, 29, 102 Efficiendum autem est ut adpetitus rationi oboediant eamque *neque praecurrant nec* propter pigritiam aut ignaviam *deserant*, where *efficiendum* calls particular attention to the result;

Lael. 12, 40 Nulla est igitur excusatio peccati, si amici causa peccaveris; nam, cum conciliatrix amicitiae virtutis opinio fuerit, difficile est amicitiam manere, si a virtute defeceris. . . . aequae autem nefas sit tale aliquid et facere rogatum et rogare. . . . Haec igitur lex in amicitia sancitur, ut *neque rogemus* res turpis *nec faciamus* rogati. This *ut*-clause has been wrongly explained

as volitive in character, because *haec lex* has been supposed to look forward to the *ut*-clause, and *rogemus* and *faciamus* have been looked upon as representing the hortatory subjunctive of the *lex*. But the whole burden of thought in the preceding chapter has been that one should never do wrong even for a friend. *Haec lex* looks backward to the principle there laid down, and the meaning is 'Let this, of which we have spoken, be an established principle in friendship, so that we shall not (i. e. with the result that we shall not) ask a friend to do wrong, nor do it ourselves when asked.'

The three following passages may be considered together: in Verr. II 3, 48, 115 Nunc, ut hoc tempore ea . . . praetermittam *neque* eos *appellem*, a quibus omne frumentum eripuit, . . . quid lucri fiat cognoscite; id. ib. II 4, 20, 45 Ut *non* conferam vitam *neque* existimationem tuam cum illius, hoc ipsum conferam, quo tu te superiorem fingis; id. de imp. Cn. Pomp. 15, 44 Itaque ut plura *non* dicam *neque* aliorum exemplis *confirmem* quantum auctoritas valeat in bello, ab eodem Cn. Pompeio omnium rerum egregiarum exempla sumantur. These passages involve the same idiom that we have in our 'so to speak.' It is customary to explain the idiom as one developed from the idea of purpose. It may well have started with some such idea, but it drifted so far away from its starting-point that oftentimes there is certainly no idea of purpose left. 'So to speak' becomes merely an apologetic phrase, meaning 'if I may say so,' 'so speaking.' In the first of the passages just cited the meaning is merely 'Now, passing by those, etc., for the present and without calling up those from whom, etc., learn,' etc. As far as the real logical relation of such clauses to the sentences in which they stand is concerned, it is often impossible to conceive of them as purpose clauses at all. When they are meant as such they take *ne* as their negative. But in the clauses above there is no such meaning. In the first clause *neque* was used for the same reason that would have made it appropriate if the expression were *praetermittens neque appellans* (if I may be allowed to use the participle in this way, to illustrate my point); and the choice of negative in the other clauses may be similarly explained. The difference between such clauses as these, and those introduced by *ne* with which they have been classed, will become evident to any one who will examine such a collection of instances as is found in Roby, Lat. Gram. 1660: Cic. ad fam. 15, 19 *ne* longior sim, vale,

'in order that I may not become tedious, I will say good-bye'; id. Deiot. 1 Crudelem Castorem, *ne dicam* sceleratum et impium, i. e. 'I call him *crudelem*, in order to avoid a harsher term'; etc., etc. It will be found that the clauses in question cannot be treated in this manner.

The use of *neque* (*nec*) to connect two verbs in the volitive subjunctive must be very carefully distinguished from that in which the negative merely negatives the idea of a single word, or phrase, in which case the negative is used without reference to the mood of the verb. Such clauses are the following:

Cic. de orat. 1, 5, 19 . . . hortemurque potius liberos nostros ceterosque, quorum gloria nobis et dignitas cara est, ut animo rei magnitudinem complectantur *neque eis* se aut praeceptis aut magistris aut exercitationibus, quibus utuntur omnes, *sed aliis quibusdam*, quod expetunt, consequi posse confidant. Here the negative in *neque* does not negative the verb at all, but merely contrasts the *eis* with the following *sed aliis*, the verb itself being, like *complectantur*, used in a positive sense;

Cic. Fin. 4, 4, 9 Quid, quod pluribus locis quasi denuntiant, ut *neque* sensuum fidem sine ratione *nec* rationis sine sensibus exquiramus, where the negatives spend their force entirely upon the phrases *sensuum fidem sine ratione* and *rationis sine sensibus*, without any regard to the mood of the verb;

Caes. B. G. 7, 75 ne tanta multitudo confusa *nec* moderari *nec* discernere suos *nec* frumentandi rationem habere possent, where the negatives connect the infinitives, without any regard to the subjunctive.<sup>1</sup>

No objection to this interpretation can be found in the fact that *neve* (*neu*) is frequently used in volitive clauses even to negative single words and phrases, e. g. Cic. de legibus 2, 27, 67 . . . eam ne quis nobis minuat *neve vivos neve mortuos*; id. ad fam. 1, 9, 19 . . . peto a te, ut id a me *neve in hoc neve in aliis requiras*. There is, in the first place, a wide difference between such clauses as these last and the others. In these last the acts (*eam* . . .

<sup>1</sup>The negatives in the following clauses from Early Latin may be similarly explained, though they seem to be extreme cases: C. I. L. I 196, 10 Magister *neque vir neque mulier* quisquam eset; Plaut. Asin. 854 *Neque divini neque mi humani* posthac quicquam adcreduas, Artemona, si huius rei me mendacem esse inveneris; and perhaps Capt. 605 (though this may be explained differently, as will appear later) *Neque* pol me insanum, Hegio, *esse* creduis *neque fuisse* umquam *neque esse* morbum, quem istic autumat, i. e. 'depend upon it, I am not crazy, nor have I ever had the disease,' etc.

*minuat* and *id . . . requiras*) are absolutely negated—they are not to occur under any conceivable circumstances. In the other passages the act in each case is to take place, but with certain exceptions and restrictions, and it is these exceptions and restrictions that are introduced by the negative in *neque* (*nec*). In each case the negative has to do only with its own particular word, or phrase, and is not affected by the character of the clause as a whole. When, however, the feeling of negative volition extends over the whole clause and everything in it, and all the negatives partake of the volitive coloring, we have *neve* (*neu*).

There now remain, as supposed instances of *neque* (*nec*) in volitive clauses, only the following passages, all of which have, in my opinion, been misinterpreted: Cic. de re pub. 1, 2, 3 Et quoniam maxime rapimur ad opes augendas generis humani studemusque nostris consiliis et laboribus tutiorem et opulentiores vitam hominum reddere . . . teneamus eum cursum, qui semper fuit optimi cuiusque, *neque* ea signa *audiamus*, quae receptui canunt, ut eos etiam revocent, qui iam processerint; Sall. Jug. 85, 47 Quam ob rem vos, quibus militaris aetas est, adnitimini mecum et capessite rem publicam: *neque* quemquam ex calamitate aliorum aut imperatorum superbia metus *ceperit*; Cic. de off. 1, 26, 92 Quae primum bene parta sit nullo *neque* turpi quaestu *neque* odioso, deinde augeatur ratione, diligentia, parsimonia, tum quam plurimis, modo dignis, se utilem praebeat, *nec* lubidini potius luxuriaeque quam liberalitati et beneficentiae pareat, though perhaps here the negative in *nec* should be looked upon as negating merely the idea of *lubidini* and *luxuriae*, as opposed to *liberalitati* and *beneficentiae*. The misinterpretation, as I conceive it, of these passages has been due primarily to the failure to recognize the extent to which a certain class of subjunctives is used in Latin, and this failure, in turn, may be due, in part at least, to a wrong theory regarding the origin of this particular usage. I refer to that use of the subjunctive which deals with expressions of obligation and propriety. Such a use of the subjunctive is hardly recognized at all by grammarians, except in certain questions like, e. g., *cur ego non laeter?* and in certain subordinate clauses like, e. g., *Nihil est cur tibi vera non dicat*. In such clauses the meaning of obligation, or propriety, must of course be recognized by all; and such clauses have been regarded as traceable to a volitive origin. Such questions as *cur ego non laeter?* are looked upon as intimately

connected with the deliberative subjunctive, and are put into the same category as *quid agam?* ('what shall I do?'). Any one may see the results of such a treatment by examining Kühner's *Ausführl. Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, Bd. II, §47, 2 b (p. 137). Here are gathered together numerous questions in the present subjunctive, all professing to illustrate the deliberative question as a subdivision of the volitive subjunctive; but the surprising thing to my mind is that questions with *ne* and questions with *non* are given side by side as illustrations of the same construction, apparently without the least consciousness that there is any difference in meaning between the two. I wish to protest against the practice of associating together such questions as *quid agam, iudices?* (Cic. Verr. 5, 1, 2), *Ne doleam?* (Cic. ad Att. 12, 40, 2), on the one hand, and *cur ego non laeter?* (Cic. Catil. 4, 1, 2) and *hunc ego non diligam? Non admirer?* (Cic. Arch. 8, 18), on the other. It seems to me that all the evidence points to their belonging to entirely distinct uses of the subjunctive mood. The questions of the first class deal with the will. When a man says *quid agam?* ('what shall I do?') he is asking himself or some one else for directions. The answer will be an expression of the will: 'Do so and so.' Similarly, the question *ne doleam?* anticipates from some source or other a prohibition 'I am not to grieve? (are those your commands?).' But the questions of the other set are very far removed from any such meaning. *Cur ego non laeter?* means 'why should I not be glad?' and the answer, so far as any is expected, will be 'you should not (ought not to) be glad for the following reasons,' etc., or 'you should (ought to) be glad,' or the like. Similarly, *hunc ego non diligam?* means 'should I not (ought I not to) love this man?'<sup>1</sup> The will in this last case is not involved in the slightest degree. There is, accordingly, no idea of deliberation in the question. Cicero's mind had been made up long before, and *hunc ego non diligam?* is merely a rhetorical way of saying "surely I ought to love such a man as this." I can find no instance in Latin literature of *non* introducing a question which is truly deliberative in character. Where that negative is used in questions which grammarians have been pleased to call delib-

<sup>1</sup> The only explanation of *non* that will prove satisfactory for all the instances concerned is one that regards it as parallel in every way with the *non* in *cur non laeter?* This interpretation may seem more acceptable later on in this paper.



erative, the context shows that the question either is settled already, and so is purely rhetorical in character and equivalent to a negative assertion of obligation, or propriety, or possibility; or else asks for information, anticipating in reply an assertion of obligation, or propriety, or possibility. It never asks for advice, or direction—it never anticipates in reply an expression of the will in any form. In other words, it is never deliberative. We should therefore never expect to find *ne* as a negative in such questions, nor in the answers to such questions, and we never do find it. And here I wish to call attention to a strange error of which Kühner has been guilty. In §47, 2 (pp. 136-7) of his Latin grammar, in speaking of questions of deliberation, he says: "Die Negation ist *ne*." He then proceeds to give a list containing ten negative questions, all of which he calls deliberative and eight of which are *negated by non*. The two which are negated by *ne* (both found in the same passage, Att. 12, 40, 2) are not independent questions at all; they depend upon the verb of demanding that has preceded. The truth is that the negative type of the deliberative question, corresponding to the Greek deliberative subjunctive with  $\mu\eta$ , is not found in the Latin language. The Latin confines its deliberative questions to positives; the Greek frequently gives them a negative form; we in English sometimes combine the two forms, e. g. 'Shall I go, or shall I not?'

While it is true that *non* never occurs in deliberative questions, as a negative of the subjunctive, it is equally true that *ne* never occurs in expressions of obligation, or propriety. The following passages may be referred to as illustrations of negative questions of obligation, or propriety: Plaut. Most. 2, 2, 24; id. Trin. 133; Ter. Hec. 342; And. 103; id. 384; Cic. Vat. 2, 4; Arch. 8, 19; Catil. 4, 1, 2; ad fam. 10, 23, 15; Planc. 7, 18. Many others will be found by consulting Merguet's Lexikon zu Cicero. But, some one will say, these questions are at least developments from the deliberative question, and so go back ultimately to a volitive origin. Of this there is not the slightest evidence. The only thing that can be said, so far as I can see, in favor of such a theory is that one can conceive how such a transition might have taken place.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is barely possible that some one might cite the following passages in support of such a view, inasmuch as they are commonly translated by the use of 'should,' while having *ne* as a negative: Cic. ad Att. 2, 1, 3 . . . *isdem ex libris perspicies et quae gesserim et quae dixerim: aut ne poposcisses; ego*

It seems to me that we must regard this use of the subjunctive as connected with the subjunctive used to express the 'would' idea (commonly designated in the grammars as the 'potential'). The two expressions 'no one would think' and 'no one should think' do not lie so far apart that one conception could not readily pass into the other. In fact, it frequently happens that one hesitates whether to use 'would' or 'should' in translating a subjunctive. Such a case is found in Tac. Ann. 3, 50 *Studia illi, ut plena vaecordiae, ita inania et fluxa sunt; nec quicquam grave ac serium ex eo metuas, qui suorum ipse flagitiorum proditor non virorum animis sed muliercularum adrepit.* In translating this passage there is really no choice between 'nor would you apprehend anything' and 'nor should you,' etc. That the two ideas are practically equivalent for certain purposes is shown by the fact they are sometimes expressed by the same word in our own language; and it is shown by similar phenomena in at least one other language besides Latin. Our word 'should' may, under certain circumstances, express obligation or propriety, or may represent the conclusion of a condition corresponding to a less vivid future condition in Latin. The sentence 'I should attack the enemy, if my commander should give the order,' may mean 'I ought to attack them' under those circumstances, or it may mean merely that the act *would* occur under those circumstances. Such a transition of thought may also be paralleled from the

---

*enim tibi me non offerebam; id. Verr. 2, 3, 84, 195 . . . sin, ut plerique faciunt, in quo erat aliqui quaestus, sed is honestus atque concessus, frumentum, quoniam vilius erat, ne emisses, sumpsisses id nummorum, quod tibi senatus cellae nomine concesserat.* But these passages do not support any such theory. In the first place, one must look upon *ne poposcisses* and *ne emisses* with suspicion. No other instance of such a use can, I believe, be found—at least before the period of Silver Latinity; and the manuscript evidence in at least one of these passages is somewhat shaky. At any rate, no argument as to the origin of a construction can be based upon one or two curiosities of comparatively late times. If these two instances are to stand, they must be looked upon as purely volitive in character. *Ne poposcisses* and *ne emisses* are simply *ne poposceris* and *ne emeris* from a past point of view—they are prohibitions conceived of in the past. Any one who would insist upon 'you should not have bought' as an accurate translation of *ne emisses* would, to be consistent, have to admit 'you should not (ought not to) buy' as an accurate translation of *ne emeris*. When *ne emisses* is translated by 'you should not have bought,' 'should not' must be understood as merely the past of 'you shall not,' which, despite the original meaning of 'shall,' contains no idea of obligation, but is merely the expression of the speaker's will.

Greek in the use of the so-called potential optative. While such expressions as οὐκ ἂν . . . ἀγορεύοις start with the idea 'you would not talk,' this has in Hom. Il. 2, 250, and elsewhere, come to mean 'you should not talk.' See Goodwin's Moods and Tenses, §237. Another proof that the two ideas are readily exchangeable is found in the fact that the place of a Greek potential optative with ἄν, in the conclusion of a condition, is sometimes taken by ἤτοι with the inf. and equivalent expressions (Goodwin's Moods and Tenses, §§502, 555). This is a clear recognition of the practical equivalence in such cases of the potential idea ('would think') and the idea of obligation and propriety. It seems at least as natural, then, to associate together these two uses of the subjunctive as it does to associate the use under discussion with a volitive idea. But I do not care to press further this theory. Let the reader still cling, if he will, to the theory of a volitive origin. In one point we must still agree, and that is that the negative in clauses of obligation and propriety is, from the earliest times to the latest, invariably *non*, and not once *ne*.

This subjunctive of obligation or propriety is the use I referred to above as not having received the recognition it deserves. What good reason is there for limiting such a use of the subjunctive to certain forms of questions and subordinate clauses, when it would suit many other clauses far better than the common interpretation? Is it not, when one stops to think of it, a little strange that grammarians and editors, without a moment's hesitation, translate such questions as *cur non audiamus?* as meaning 'why should we not hear?' and then apparently regard it as impossible that *non audiamus*, without the *cur*, can mean 'we should not hear'? In the question with *cur* the negative is, without exception, from the earliest times *non*—never *ne*—and still, when exactly the same thing is found in a declarative form, grammarians (e. g. Kühner, II, p. 145) and commentators proceed to work out some ingenious theory to show how *non* came to be used where *ne* would have been expected.

If those who are interested in this question will only get rid of the idea that the subjunctive in clauses of obligation or propriety must in some way be associated with the volitive subjunctive, and will then recognize this use as having somewhat freer scope than they have been accustomed to suppose, they will find that many difficulties will be at once disposed of. They will, in the first

place, be relieved of the necessity of explaining why those few clauses which they are willing to call clauses of obligation have *non* instead of *ne*. But this will be only a beginning of the satisfaction that their new belief will bring them. The passages from Cicero and Sallust which prompted these remarks will then be perfectly clear and their negatives perfectly regular. The one from the *de re pub.*: *teneamus eum cursum, qui semper fuit optimi cuiusque; neque ea signa audiamus quae etc.*, will then mean 'we should keep to that course which has always been that of all good men, and should not heed the signals which,' etc.<sup>1</sup> The *neque quemquam metus ceperit* in Sallust will mean 'nor should any one fear.' Many other difficulties will cease to be difficulties. In Cic. *pro Cluent.* 57, 155 *Quoniam omnia comoda nostra, iura, libertatem, salutem denique legibus obtinemus, a legibus non recedamus*, the *non recedamus* will mean 'we should not recede.' The negatives in the following passages may be similarly explained: Cic. *de re pub.* 4, 6, 6 *Nec vero mulieribus praefectus praeponatur . . .*, sed sit censor, qui viros doceat moderari uxoribus; id. *ad Att.* 14, 13 A *Patere, obsecro, te pro re publica videri gessisse simultatem cum patre eius: non contemperis hanc familiam; honestius enim et libentius deponimus inimicitias rei publicae nomine susceptas quam contumaciae.*

The choice of *non* instead of *ne* will now be clearly understood in such passages as the following: Ter. *And.* 787 *Hic est ille: non te credas Davom ludere*; Plaut. *Trin.* 133 *Non ego illi argentum redderem?* Cic. *Arch.* 8, 18 *Hunc ego non diligam? Non admirer? Non omni ratione defendendum putem?* id. 19 *Nos . . . non poetarum voce moveamur?* *ad fam.* 14, 4, 5 *Quid nunc rogem te, ut venias, mulierem aegram et corpore et animo confectam? Non rogem?* *Sine te igitur sim?* We noticed earlier in this paper that *neque* (*nec*) is not found in Early Latin in clauses that are stamped as volitive in character by the use of an

<sup>1</sup> The whole context is distinctly in favor of taking *audiamus* in this sense. There is no instance of any such hortatory expression previous to this in the production, nor on the pages following. On the other hand, there are, in the ten lines next preceding, repeated expressions of obligation denoting what 'we ought to do,' e. g. *Ergo ille civis . . . ipsis est praeferendus doctoribus; quae est enim istorum oratio tam equisita quae sit anteponenda bene constitutae civitati publico iure et moribus? Equidem quem ad modum urbis magnas viculis et castellis praeferendas puto, sic eos, qui his urbibus consilio atque auctoritate praesunt, iis, qui omnis negotii publici expertes sunt, longe duco sapientia ipsa esse anteponendos.*

imperative or by the use of an accompanying *ne* or *neve*. In the face of such a condition of things, one must feel great hesitation in supposing *neque* (*nec*) to be used in any volitive clause during that period. And still, what is to be done with the following? Plaut. Bacch. 476 *Ipsus neque amat, nec tu credas*; id. Capt. 149 Ah, Hegio, numquam istuc dixis *neque* animum *induxis* tuom; id. Trin. 627 *Noli avorsari neque te occultassis* mihi (This is the only passage in which a clear prohibition of any sort precedes. It does not count for much against the mass of evidence bearing in the other direction, and it is not necessary here to regard *neque occultassis* as a prohibition); Enn. Ann. 143 (Baehrens) *Nec mi aurum posco nec mi pretium dederitis*; id. 509 *Nemo me dacrumis decoret nec funera fleta faxit*; Lucil. Sat. 30 (Baehrens 775) *neque* barbam *inmiseris*; Ter. And. 392 *Nec tu ea causa minueris* haec quae facis. The explanation I have suggested clears up all of these passages. The failure to recognize the use of the subjunctive for which I am pleading has repeatedly resulted in the corruption of manuscripts by scholars who could not understand the negative they found there. No less distinguished scholars than Riese and Schmalz are among those to whom I allude. In his admirable edition of Catullus, Riese (followed by Schmalz, Lat. Synt., §31) changes *non siris* to *ne siris* in Catul. 66, 91 *Tu vero, regina, tuens cum sidera divam Placabis festis luminibus Venerem, Unguinis expertem non siris esse tuam me, sed potius largis adfice muneribus*. I am convinced that there is not the slightest evidence of any kind for this reading. The manuscripts, without exception, read *non*. *Ne* with the perfect subjunctive is a construction unknown to Catullus. More than that, it is a construction not found in any poet, except 4 times in Horace, from the time of Terence till after the Augustan Age (and it is rare even then), while the construction involved in my interpretation of the passage is found in every prominent poet of the Golden Age. I showed, too, in Part I of this paper, that *ne* with the perfect is not used in dignified address until Silver Latin. This is true even in Horace, the only poet who uses the construction at all. But the passage in Catullus is addressed to a queen (*regina Berenice*, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus), and such a harsh and abrupt address would not be in harmony with the mock-heroic style of the poem.<sup>1</sup> Similar

<sup>1</sup> My interpretation is in perfect harmony with the remark of Quintilian in I, 5, 50, of which so much has been made by those who read *ne siris*. See my Appendix.



corruptions have taken place for similar reasons in Rutil. Lup. II 9 *non credideris*; Sen. Nat. Qu. I, 3 *non dubitaveris*; Nepos, Ages. 4, 1 *quare veniret non dubitaret*. On the reading in these passages cf. Reisig-Haase, Lat. Synt., neu bearbeitet von Schmalz und Landgraf, p. 481. Manuscripts only too often need to be delivered from their friends.

We are now ready to return to the passages in Cicero that have prompted all of these remarks. My explanation of *nec* with the perfect subjunctive in those passages has, I presume, already been surmised. They seem to me instances of that particular phase of the so-called (unfortunately<sup>1</sup>) potential subjunctive which is commonly translated by the use of the auxiliary 'would,' or, in the first person, 'should.' In applying this test to the various instances, one must keep in mind that this idea sometimes approaches that of obligation or propriety, and that in such cases one need not hesitate, in translating, to use the auxiliary 'should' instead of 'would.' The subjunctive in Acad. 2, 46, 141 *Tam moveor quam tu, Luculle, nec me minus hominem quam te putaveris*, is then to be translated 'nor would you (should you) for a moment think that I,' etc. Such a translation makes equally good sense in all the other passages in question. It is open, so far as I can see, to no objection of any kind. On the other hand, it receives a striking confirmation at the hands of Cicero himself. I refer to Cic. Tusc. Disp. I, 41, 98 *Ne vos quidem, iudices, mortem timueritis*. Grammars (e. g. Roby, 1602; Draeger, Hist. Synt., §149 B; Kühner, Ausf. Lat. Gram. II, §47, 9, p. 143) are wont to classify this as a prohibition, instead of taking *ne* and *quidem* together in the sense of 'not even.' This would be in conflict with two principles I laid down in Part I of my paper: (1) that the perfect subjunctive is not used in prohibitions addressed to *iudices*, or in other dignified prohibitions, and (2) that it is not, except in two or three passages, used with verbs denoting mere mental activity, before the period of decline. On these grounds alone I should reject the interpretation referred to above. But, fortunately, I am not in the present instance obliged to trust to such deductions. The whole passage in Cicero is a close translation of chapters 32

<sup>1</sup> The term 'potential' ought, it seems to me, to be limited to expressions of ability and possibility—to the 'can' and the 'may' ideas. I see nothing in the term 'potential' that makes it appropriate for designating any other construction.

and 33 of Plato's *Apologia Socratis*. The part of which the particular sentence concerned is a translation runs as follows: 'Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑμᾶς χρή, ὧ ἄνδρες δικάσται, εὐελπίδας εἶναι πρὸς τὸν θάνατον.' The perfect subjunctive is, then, here equivalent to *χρή* with the infinitive. This, taken in connection with the use, above referred to, of *χρή* and the infinitive for the potential optative in conclusions of conditions, seems to me to prove beyond all possible doubt that *non timueritis* may, without the least hesitation, be translated by 'you should not fear,' *nec putaveris* by 'nor should you think,' etc., etc., wherever 'should' seems to make a better translation than 'would.'

I have called attention above to the fact that the predominance, in the construction of *nec* with the perfect subjunctive, of verbs denoting mere mental activity proves that the construction cannot be the same as that formed by *ne* with the perfect. But the classes of verbs found in this construction form as strong an argument in favor of my interpretation as they form against the common interpretation. It will be noticed that of the 10 verbs in this construction in Cicero, 8 are verbs of mental action or of saying. By referring to the sections on the potential subjunctive and the subjunctive of modest assertion in any of our Latin grammars, it will be found that in a similarly large majority of the examples there given the verbs belong to one or the other of these two classes. Roby calls attention to the striking predominance of such verbs in the potential mood (the term 'potential' being employed to include such uses as *nemo putet* 'no one would think'), and especially when the perfect tense is used, in his *Latin Grammar*, §1536 (cf. also Kühner, II, §46, p. 133). In §§1536-46 he gives a large number of instances of the perfect subjunctive in the 1st person and an equally large number in the 3d person, accompanied in both persons by negatives, and all explained as instances of the so-called potential (to be translated by 'would' or, in the 1st person, by 'should'). But instances of the 2d person, accompanied by a negative, exactly similar in everything other than in the person and showing the same striking predominance of verbs of the same sort, Roby, like all the rest, classifies with the perfect subjunctive, under the sections on prohibitions (v. §1602). The only exception I find is *nec laudaveris* (Cic. Leg. 3, 1), out of which, fortunately, no one could possibly make a prohibition. Why such a dearth of these perfects in the 2d person, when they are so very common in the

1st and 3d persons? The truth seems to be that they are plentiful enough, if we will only recognize them when we see them.

I hope it will be admitted that I have made good my claim that *neque* (*nec*) is never found in Ciceronian prose with a volitive subjunctive. If any one still clings to the belief that some of the clauses I have just been considering are volitive, then I would remind him again of the fact, an all-important one in this connection, that, among all the clauses introduced by *ne* or *neve* and continued by the addition of a second verb (and there are, literally, hundreds of such clauses), *neque* (*nec*) is, with but a single exception in a second-rate writer, unknown to prose as a connective, and extremely rare in poetry, before the time of Livy. There are so many such clauses that this omission cannot be accounted for as a matter of chance. Until some one can explain the absence of *neque* (*nec*) from all the various clauses, dependent and independent, which alone are known to be volitive in feeling, we certainly have a right to insist that he shall exhaust all other possible explanations before ever recognizing *neque* as used with a volitive subjunctive in Ciceronian prose.

A word should now be said regarding the use of *nihil* (*nil*), *numquam*, *ne—quidem*, and *nullus* with the perfect subjunctive. They occur as follows:

NIHIL (NIL): Plaut. Mil. 1007 Hercle hanc quidem *nil* tu *amassis*; mihi desponsast; Rud. 1135 tu mihi *nihilum ostenderis*; Curc. 384 *Nil* tu me saturum *monueris*. Memini et scio; Ps. 232 *Nil curassis*: liquido's animo: ego pro me et pro te curabo; Most. 511 *Nil* me *curassis*: ego mihi providero; Cic. in Verr. 2, 1, 54, 141 *nihil* ab isto vafrum, *nihil* veteratorium *expectaveritis*; pro Mur. 31, 65 "*Nihil ignoveris*." Immo aliquid, non omnia. "*Nihil omnino gratiae concesseris*." Immo insistito, cum officium et fides postulabit; ad Att. 2, 9 *nihil* me *existimaris* neque usu neque a Theophrasto didicisse; ib. 4, 17 (18), 4 De me *nihil timueris*, sed tamen promitto nihil; ib. 5, 11 Tu velim Piliam meis verbis consolere; indicabo enim tibi; tu illi *nihil dixeris*; accepi fasciculum, in quo erat epistola Piliae; ib. 5, 21 A Quinto fratre his mensibus *nihil expectaris*; nam Taurus propter nivis ante mensem Iunium transiri non potest; ib. 7, 8, 2 animadverteram posse pro re nata te non incommode ad me in Albanum venire III. Nonas Ianuar.; sed, amabo te, *nihil* incommodo valetudinis *feceris*: quid enim est tantum in uno aut altero die? ib. 8,

2 Nihil arbitror fore, quod reprehendas. Si qua erunt, doce me, quo modo effugere possim. "*Nihil*" inquires "*omnino scripseris*"; ad Quintum 1, 1, 4, 14 sed si quis est, in quo iam offenderis, de quo aliquid senseris, huic *nihil credideris, nullam partem* estimationis tuae *commiseris*;

NUMQUAM: Plaut. Capt. 149 Ego alienus? Alienus ille? Ah, Hegio, *numquam* istuc *dixis* neque animum induxis tuom; Sall. Jug. 110, 4 arma viros pecuniam, postremo quicquid animo lubet, sume utere, et quoad vives, *numquam* tibi redditam gratiam *putaveris*;

NE . . . QUIDEM, NULLUS: Cic. Tusc. Disp. 1, 41, 98 *Ne* vos *quidem*, iudices ii, qui me absolvistis, mortem *timueritis* (cf. Tusc. Disp. 2, 13, 32 Te vero ita adfectum *ne* virum *quidem* quisquam *dixerit*); Plaut. Bacch. 90 Ille quidem hanc abducet: *nullus* tu *adfueris*, si non lubet; Ter. Hec. 79 Si quaeret me, uti tum dicas: si non quaeret, *nullus dixeris*. It is customary to treat these as prohibitions, but it is practically certain that some of them are not volitive in character. It will be noticed that in most of these instances the verbs are such as indicate mere mental activity, which in itself practically decides the case against interpreting them as volitive subjunctives. Not only that, but whereas we found that *ne* with the perfect was in classical times used only in familiar, every-day address, and was carefully avoided on dignified occasions, in the passages under discussion there are repeated instances of the perfect subjunctive on such occasions. Take, for example, *nihil expectaveritis* in Verr. II 1, 54, 144. If this were taken as a prohibition belonging to the same class as *ne* with the perfect, it would, as shown in Part I of this paper, be abrupt and harsh in tone, and not at all calculated to make a favorable impression upon the *iudices* to whom it is addressed. But under the other interpretation it would be very deferential and complimentary in tone. The expression 'you would (of course) expect nothing' implies full confidence in the good sense and judgment of the *iudices*, and would in every way be appropriate to the occasion. The passage from Cic. Tusc. Disp. is shown, by the Greek passage of which it is a literal translation, to be equivalent to  $\chi\rho\eta$  with the infinitive. In the only instance, then, where positive proof of this nature is at hand, my objection to regarding similar constructions as belonging to the volitive subjunctive is shown to be well founded. There is, to be sure, no serious objection to interpreting some of these as *bona fide*

prohibitions. It is possible even that some of them are in the future perfect indicative. There does not seem to be evidence enough at hand to settle absolutely each individual case.

#### APPENDIX.

I ought perhaps to say a word regarding the use of prohibitive expressions in Silver Latin. It will be noticed that I have several times referred to Livy as marking the time when new constructions began to appear. Any one who has taken pains to examine any work on Latin Style, treated historically (e. g. that of Schmalz in Müller's Handbuch), must have noticed that Livy is very distinctly an innovator. New constructions, new words, new phrases, new ways of putting things fairly swarm into literary prose through the pages of Livy. He may be said in some respects to mark the beginning of the period of decline. This must be my excuse for classing him here with the writers of Silver Latin. So far, however, as the usages I have been considering are concerned, he seems to depart from what we have found to be the standards of classical prose only in one important particular, viz. he occasionally uses *neque* (*nec*) instead of the classical *neve* (*neu*) in clauses introduced by *ne*. This use of *neque* (*nec*) occurs as follows: 2, 32, 10 . . . *conspirasse inde ne manus ad os cibum ferrent, nec os acciperet datum, nec dentes, quae conficerent*; 3, 21, 6 *dum ego ne imiter tribunos nec me contra senatus consultum consulem renuntiari patiar*; 4, 4, 11 *Cur non sancitis, ne vicinus patricio sit plebeius nec eodem itinere eat, ne idem convivium ineat, ne in foro eodem consistat*? 26, 42, 2 . . . *periculum esse ratus, ne eo facto in unum omnes contraheret, nec par esset unus tot exercitibus*.

This use of *neque* (*nec*) in Livy in volitive clauses will perhaps cause greater uncertainty than would be felt in Ciceronian times regarding the correct explanation of certain other uses of *neque* (*nec*) with the subjunctive. It is, however, difficult, when one compares the instances of *neque* (*nec*) with the perfect subjunctive presented by Livy with the similar cases in Cicero, to resist the conclusion that they are to be interpreted in the same way. For the convenience of those who wish to make a comparison with earlier usage, I append a list of the prohibitive expressions found in Livy, including these questionable instances of *neque* (*nec*).



*Ne with Perfect Subjunctive.*

7, 34, 5 *ne dederis* (addressed by a tribune to a consul at a time of great emergency); 7, 40, 12 *ne destileris* (addressed in bitter irony by the consul to the leader of mutinous soldiers); 9, 34, 15 *ne degeneraveris* (uttered by a tribune in a tirade against Appius Claudius for refusing to give up office at the expiration of his term); 10, 8, 6 *ne fastidieris* (earnest plea for his rights which had been denied); 21, 44, 6 *ne transieris* (Hannibal working on the passions of his soldiers, by quoting the arrogant demands of the enemy); 22, 49, 8 *ne funestiam hanc pugnam morte consulis feceris* (appeal for the life of the consul); 30, 30, 19 *ne tot annorum felicitatem in unius horae dederis discrimen* (Hannibal to opposing general, Scipio); 31, 7 *ne aequaveritis* (not a prohibition, but a concession) Hannibali Philippum, *ne Carthaginensibus Macedonas. Pyrrho certe aequabitur. Aequabitur dico?* Quantum vel vir viro vel gens genti praestat! 40, 14 *ne miscueris* (Demetrius, who had been accused of trying to murder his brother, in tears, addressing his father, who is acting as judge).

*Neque (nec) with Perfect Subjunctive.*

5, 53, 3 *nec id mirati sitis* (addressed to the Quirites); 21, 43, 11 *nec existimaveris* (Hannibal to his soldiers); 23, 3, 3 *nec quicquam raptim aut forte temere egeritis*; 29, 18, 9 *neque in Italia neque in Africa quicquam gesseritis* (addressed to the *patres conscripti*).

*Numquam, nusquam with Perfect Subjunctive.*

Livy 1, 32, 7 *numquam siris* (addressed to Jupiter); 21, 44, 6 *nusquam te moveris*.

*Ne with Present Subjunctive.*

44, 22 *rumores credulitate vestra ne alatis* (Weissenborn).

*Neque (nec) with the Present Subjunctive.*

22, 39, 21 *armatus intentusque sis neque occasione tuae desis neque occasionem hosti des*.

*Neque with Imperative.*

22, 10, 5 *neque scelus esto* (probably = 'and it shall be no crime,' the negative spending its force upon *scelus*).

*Ne with Imperative.*3, 2, 9 *ne timele.**Noli with Infinitive.*

7, 24, 6 *nolite expectare*; 7, 40, 16 *nolite adversus vos velle experiri*; 10, 8, 5 *noli erubescere*; 32, 21 *nolite fastidire* (twice); 34, 4 *nolite existimare*; 34, 31 *nolite exigere*; 38, 17 *nolite existimare*; 38, 46 *nolite existimare*.

*Cave with Present Subjunctive.*

5, 16, 9 *cave sinas*; 8, 32, 8 *cave mittas*; 22, 49, 9 *cave absumas*; 30, 14, 11 *cave deformes et corrumpas*.

My statistics for Silver Latin proper cover only Phaedrus, the tragedies of Seneca, Tacitus and the Declamationes that commonly go under the name of Quintilian. They have, however, been so hurriedly gathered that I will not vouch for their completeness, though the omissions cannot be many. My examination of these authors leads me to think it probable that the principles I have laid down for classical times will, in the main, hold also for Silver Latin, though, as we should expect, in view of the general breaking up of classical standards, exceptions are more common. Prohibitions (including, as usual, the instances of *neque* [*nec*]) occur, in the works mentioned, as follows:

*Ne with the Perfect Subjunctive.*

Phaedrus: App. 11 *ne istud dixeris* (gymnast to a man who had questioned his strength); 26, 5 *ne timueris* (countryman to a hare).

Seneca: none.

Tacitus: Ann. 6, 8 *ne patres conscripti cogitaveris*; Hist. 1, 16 *ne territus fueris* (Galba to his successor in office, familiarly grasping his hand); 2, 77 *ne Mucianum spreveris* (Mucianus to Vespasian).

Quintiliani (?) Declam.: none.

*Neque (nec) with Perfect Subjunctive.*

Phaedrus: none.

Seneca: none.

Tac. Hist. 2, 47 *nec tempus computaveritis*; 2, 76 *nec expaveris*.

Quintiliani (?) Declamationes 249 *neque negaveris* (three times); 257 *neque spectaveris*.

*Nihil with Perfect Subjunctive.*

Tacitus: Ann. 16, 22 *nihil ipse scripseris*.

*Ne with Present Subjunctive.*

Phaedrus and Seneca: none.

Tacitus: Dial. 17 *ne dividatis*.

Quintiliani (?) Declamationes 306 *ne quid improbe petas*.

*Neque (nec) with Present Subjunctive.*

Phaedrus, Seneca, Quint. (?) Declam.: none.

Tac. Ann. 3, 50, 5 *nec metuas*; id. ib. 6, 8 *nec adsequare*.

*Ne with Imperative.*

Seneca: Thyest. 917 *ne parce*; 984 *ne metue*; Phoen. Frgm. 495 *ne verere*; 556 *ne erue neve everte*; 645 *ne metue*; Phaed. 136 *extingue neve praebe*; 227 *ne crede*; 1002 *ne metue*; 1249 *ne metue*; Medea 1024 *ne propera*.

*Noli with Infinitive.*

Phaedrus: 1, 25 *noli vereri*; 2, 3 *noli facere*; 3, 18 *noli adfectare*; 4, 7 *noli esse*.

Quintiliani (?) Declamationes 247 *noli mirari*; 315 *nolite dare*; 375 *noli dicere*.

As regards the use of *non* in Silver Latin, I believe that it still continued to be carefully distinguished from *ne*. It will be found that some of the supposed instances of *non* in the sense of *ne* may be explained by understanding the *non* to spend its force upon some particular word<sup>1</sup>; and that the others, without exception, become perfectly clear if the subjunctive concerned is understood as one denoting obligation, or propriety, of which *non* and *neque* are the regular negatives. To this latter class belong, for instance, Sen. Q. N. 1, 3, 3 *non dubitaveris*; Rutil. Lup. II 9 *non credideris*; Sen. Ep. 99, 14 *non imperemus*; Quint. 1, 1, 5 *Non assuescat ergo sermoni, qui dediscendus sit*; id. 7, 1, 56 *non desperemus*; etc. Even the much-cited passage in Ovid: *aut non tentaris aut perfice*,

<sup>1</sup> This hypothesis will also explain the supposed occurrence of *non* with the imperative in Ovid. No other author, I believe, has been suspected of such barbarism; cf. Schmalz, Lat. Synt. 37; Kühner, Ausführl. Gram. d. Lat. Spr. II, §48, 1.

may be explained in the same way: 'you should either not try at all, or else, if you do, effect your object.' An unjustified use has been made in this connection of Quint. 1, 5, 50 *qui tamen dicat pro illo ne feceris non feceris*, in idem incidat vitium, quia alterum negandi est alterum vetandi. This passage has been cited to show that *non feceris* is not good Latin, whereas it distinctly says that it is good Latin. Quintilian is merely trying to explain the difference in use between *ne* and *non*, as any one might do in a similar treatise. He does not even imply that *non* ever was used in literature in the sense of *ne*. All he says is that *if a man should so use it (dicat), he would make the same mistake*, etc. It is then probable that *aut non tentaris aut perfice* does not represent an error of a class to which Quintilian has been supposed to refer, but that it is a perfectly legitimate usage. Still, inasmuch as *neque (nec)* is found with the imperative mood in poetry, and inasmuch as there are undoubted instances in the prose of Silver Latin of *neque (nec)* in clauses of negative purpose, it must be admitted that there may be some doubt about my interpretation of *non* in some of the clauses cited from this period. But it seems to me that, to say the least, the probabilities are on my side.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

H. C. ELMER.

### III.—THE JUDAEO-GERMAN ELEMENT IN THE GERMAN LANGUAGE.

#### AUTHORITIES CONSULTED.

- Grimm, J. and W.: Deutsches Wörterbuch.  
Weigand, F. L. K.: Deutsches Wörterbuch. 2d edition.  
Sanders, D.: Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.  
Kluge, F.: An Etymological Dictionary of the German Language. London, 1891.  
Bernd, Ch. S. Th.: Die deutsche Sprache in dem Grossherzogthume Posen. Bonn, 1820.  
Avé-Lallemant, F. Ch. B.: Das deutsche Gaunerthum.  
Tendlau, A.: Sprichwörter und Redensarten deutsch-jüdischer Vorzeit.  
Grünbaum, M.: Jüdisch-deutsche Chrestomathie.  
Schmeller, J. A.: Bayerisches Wörterbuch. 2d edition.

From the early Bible translations in Judaeo-German in the middle of the sixteenth century, and the consequent dissemination of Judaeo-German literature, it is quite obvious that the Jews had just begun to introduce Hebrew words into their speech, and that this habit developed into a set *modus loquendi* in the next century. Thieves and vagabonds, among whom there were many from the Jewish community, gladly seized upon the opportunity of incorporating words from this source into their unintelligible gibberish. Before the middle of the sixteenth century the introduction of these words was more or less arbitrary; this is evident from the fact that they have not maintained themselves in J.G. itself. Thus, in the manuscript vocabulary of Gerold Edlibach, alderman at Zurich, from the year 1488,<sup>1</sup> we find, among others, the words *alcha* 'gan,' *lechhem* 'brott,' *jochhem* 'win,' *boshart* 'fleisch,' freely formed from  $\text{הָלֶךְ}$ ,  $\text{לֶחֶם}$ ,  $\text{יַיִן}$ ,  $\text{בֶּשַׂר}$  respectively, none of which are to be found in J.G. So, too, in the Liber Vagatorum the number of Hebrew words that have disappeared from J.G. is considerable. In the following centuries there is a large accretion of real J.G. words to the Vagabonds' vocabulary.<sup>2</sup> When Avé-Lallemant undertook the investigation of German vaga-

<sup>1</sup> Avé-Lallemant, IV 59.

<sup>2</sup> For example, in Christensen's collection of 1811 (Avé-Lallemant, IV 199 ff.). That the thieves drew directly on the Jargon of Jews, especially Polish Jews, is seen here in the use of several Polish words, which Avé-Lal. wrongly supposes to be Bohemian.



bonds,<sup>1</sup> he found it necessary to devote the greater part of one volume to the study of Judaeo-German. He lacked, however, a proper philological training, and his statements must be taken with a great deal of caution, and were it not for a valuable collection of facts, this part of his work would be entirely worthless. Nor was he more fortunate in his philological deductions in Thieves' slang, and his rich accumulation of data still awaits the careful investigator.

A number of Hebrew words have found their way into many German dialects either directly from J.G. or through the medium of Thieves' slang, but in the present paper only such as have been incorporated in the dictionaries of High German are considered. If a word is to be found in J.G. or Slavo-Judaeo-German (in which forms are frequently better preserved) it is to be at once classed as of J.G. origin; if it deviates in form or meaning, and is represented in Slang, its J.G. origin is secondary. The dictionaries, as will be seen from the examples given, take no strict account of this, and in some cases class a word indiscriminately as J.G., Slang, or even Hebrew; this is notably the case with Kluge.

The original Hebrew sources from which the Jews derived their vocabulary are the Bible and neo-Hebraic literature, especially the Talmud. Weigand and Sanders therefore overstep the bounds when in explaining the word *Kafiller* they ascribe it to Syrian origin: der *Kafiller*, -s, Pl. wie Sing.: Schinder. Erst im 17. Jahrh. Mit *i* aus *e*, *ä* zumal Anlehnung an niederd. der *viller* = Schinder und vielleicht auch an bayer. das *Gefill* = Recht des Abdeckers auf das gefallene Vieh nahe liegt. Das Wort ist nämlich aus der gaunerischen (rothwelschen) Sprache, in welcher *caveller*, *Kavaller*, *cafäller*, *Kofaller* = Schinder, abgeleitet von talmudisch *Kefál* (כפאל), welches im Syrischen abdecken, abziehen bedeutet und diese Bed. in seiner Pael-Form *Kapël* (כפול) wahrte. Nicht aber kommt es von einem ahd. *Kafillan* = die Haut abziehen, geizeln, zumal da dieses erst im 10.-12. Jahrh. in der Form *ke-*, *gi-*, *ge-* sich zeigende Wort nur im Prät. und Part. des Prät. vorkommt und überhaupt das alte *ka-* schon im Ahd. eben zu *ke-*, *gi-*, *ge-* sich abschwächt. Weigand, I 749. Cf. Sanders, I 443; Schmeller, I 709; Grimm, V 26; Avé-Lallemant, IV 528. In addition to its probable derivation from *gefill*, I propose another one: in the language of the flayers *caval* (from

<sup>1</sup> Das deutsche Gaunerthum (Leipzig, F. A. Brockhaus, 1858-62).

Lat. *caballus*) means a 'horse,' probably 'dead horse, one that is to be skinned'; this may have led to the formation of *cavaller*, one of the forms given by Weigand and Avé-Lallemant.

Another mistake is made by all dictionaries in trying to explain the origin of the words from the so-called Portuguese pronunciation of Hebrew; this is fundamentally wrong, as at no time, probably, was that pronunciation current in Germany, and certainly not in the sixteenth century. The German or Polish pronunciation alone can be considered.<sup>1</sup> This mistake is apparent, for example, in Grimm, when the author differentiates *schacher* as deduced from Hebrew שָׁחַר, and *schachern* from שָׁחַר; since the second was pronounced *sochar*, it could not have served as the base for the verb. The Portuguese pronunciation does not help to explain the natural changes of a word in its passage from Hebrew to German.

The above-mentioned mistake in Grimm arises from a third misconception—namely, that any form of speech may have served as the root for a Judaeo-German word, whereas in reality only nouns, adjectives, adverbs and participles have been purloined; in the Slang the creative fancy is somewhat freer, and a Slang word can frequently be detected by this freer formation, and it is not necessary to make some verbal form responsible for a vowel-change. As a rule, the words have undergone no greater change than such as is conditioned by the spirit of the German language. To ascribe, therefore, Germ. *paschen* 'to smuggle' to פָּשַׁע 'transgression,'<sup>2</sup> a word which is not to be found in J.G. or Slang, and which demands a change of *e* to *a*, is to do violence to the word.

But the authors of dictionaries are guilty of a still graver negligence: they have not always inquired into the exact meaning of J.G. words, and have occasionally given preposterous explanations. It is the purpose of the present paper to gather together all words of J.G. origin found in any of the greater dictionaries, and to make all corrections which it is at present possible to make, so that future lexicographers may know by what statement and what author they can be guided.

J.G. *Benschen* 'to bless, pronounce a benediction' and *oren* 'to pray' have found their way into German dictionaries: they are of French origin and will be treated elsewhere.

<sup>1</sup> A special article devoted to the German pronunciation of Hebrew will be found in one of the forthcoming numbers of the 'Hebraica.'

<sup>2</sup> Weigand, II 308.

*Acheln.*

*Acheln* = essen; Weigand, I 14; Grimm, I 162; Sanders, I 7; Kluge, 3.

*Hacheln*, essen; wol das jüdisch-deutsche *acheln*; Schmeller, I 1041. *Acheln*, *ocheln*, *aucheln*, *achel*, *auchel*, *ochel* sein, essen, speisen; Avé-Lallemant, IV 516.

All ascribe the word correctly to the Hebrew root אכל 'to eat.' Two proverbs in J.G. preserve it: *Achele'*, *bachele'*, *böche'*, Is sein beschte Melöche! "Essen, trinken und schlafen ist seine beste Arbeit," Tendlau, 159. Das is e *Achel-Peter*! "ein Fress-Peter," Fresser; ib. *Achel-Peter* in Thieves' slang: der faule, unthätige, abgelebte Gauner, der nichts mehr zum Besten der Genossenschaft thut und gibt, sondern sich ernähren lässt, *Mitt-esser*, Avé-Lallemant, IV 516.

die *Achel*, Pl. -n: Speise, Mahl. Judenwort, aus hebr. die *achlāh* (אָחֵלָה) = Speise, Weigand, I 14. This is incorrect. אָחֵלָה means 'mud-eater' or 'occupied space.' The corresponding form is אָחֵלָה, *achile* in Thieves' slang (Avé-Lallemant) and Slavo-Judaeo-German (Judaeo-German as spoken in Russia). It is merely a German formation like *achler* 'eater' in S.J.G.

*Begern.*

*bägern* = quälen, plagen. Schwäbisch, aber ursprünglich wol aus der Gaunersprache, in welcher *bögren*, *bogäen* = hauen, schlagen. Woher diese? Weigand, I 116.

*bägern*, vexiare, cruciare: Schmid, der das ahd. *pakan*, mhd. *bagen*, zanken vergleicht. Stadler verzeichnet aber *baggen*, *backen*, hauen, hacken. Grimm, I 1075.

*bägern* (mundartlich): bis auf den Tod quälen . . . Viell. nach dem Jüd.-Deutsch. aus פֶּגֶר (*peger*), ein Todter, Leiche. Sanders, I 68.

*begern* (Juden-Wort, verächtlich), sterben, v. hebr. *peger*, hinfällig sein. Schmeller, I 215.

*bägern* 'to torment, plague,' prob. allied to OHG. *bagan*, MidHG. *bagen*, str. vb. 'to contend, quarrel.' Akin to Irish *bagim* 'I contend,' *bag* 'combat'; hence the Aryan root is *bhegh*, *bhogh*. Kluge, 16.

*Pegern*, from Hebr. פֶּגֶר, is the common word in J.G. and S.J.G. for 'to die' (speaking contemptuously); in Thieves' slang it also means 'to kill, poison,' Avé-Lallemant, 581; hence the above meaning.

*Betuches.*

*betuchen*, demergi . . . dieser lebendige ausdrück ist uns selbst versunken und untergegangen, nur einige spuren haften noch davon. Hebel, s. 274 in der erzählung vom schimmel, sagt: und ging ganz still und *betuches* wieder in sein bett; dies adverbiale *betuches* will sagen sachte, leise niedergetaucht, geduckt. in der gaunersprache heisst *scheft beducht!* sei still, geheim, *beduchter massematen* diebstahl ohne lerm . . . Grimm, I 1740.

*betüchen* und *betücht*, Adj. u. Adv.: still nachsinnend, still in sich gekehrt, versteckt verschwiegen, z. B. ein *betuchener* (*betuchter*) Mann, *betuchen* (*betucht*) zusehen. Ursprünglich Gaunerwort für leise, still, verschwiegen, geheim, aus hebr. *bâtûach* (בטוח) = Vertrauen habend, sicher, dem Part. des Passivs von *bâtach* (בטח) = vertrauen. Unsere Juden sprechen jenes Part. *betüche* und sagen z. B. "ein *betücher* isch" = ein Mann auf den man vertrauen kann. Auch jüdisch-deutsch das Adv. *betüches* (Hebel, Der Schimmel, am Schlusse) = still in sich gekehrt, aus dem von unseren Juden *betüches* gesprochenen hebr. *bâtûachoth* (בטוחות), dem Plur. des Fem. jenes *bâtûach*, und solche Plurale stehen gern adverbial. Das *t* in *betucht* ist angetreten, und nichts gemein hat dieses Wort mit mittelniederl. *bedocht*, neuniederl. *beducht*, = bekümmert, besorgt, im Mittelniederl. auch s. v. a. entschlossen. Weigand, I 184.

*betüches*, adv. (mundart.): ruhig . . . vgl. hebr. *betach*, in Ruhe, *batuchoth*, Vertrauen, etc.; schwerlich wie Grimm und Schmeller meinen, zu "tauchen, sich ducken" gehörig. Sanders, I 128.

*betuchen*, *betucht*, adj. and adv., 'quiet(ly), reserved(ly)'; of Hebr. origin (*bâtûach* 'confident, sure'). Kluge, 29.

*betucht*, d. h. stille seyn; . . . vom hebr. *batûach*, Ptc. präs. von *batach*, vertrauen, ruhig und sicher seyn. Vilmar, kurhess. Idiot. 33, *betücht* 1) sicheres Vermögens, wohlstehend; 2) stille, schweigsam, bedrückt. Schmeller, I 491.

Weigand's explanation is not quite correct. The word is of rare occurrence in J.G. Tendlau, 66 gives: Ein bloß vermögender Mann heisst "ein Betuechter" von *botuach*, sicher zuverlässig, homo securus. In S.J.G. *botuach* (Hebr. בטוח) means 'homo securus.' No other form is to be found. It is more likely that the words passed into German from Thieves' slang: *betuach*, *betuch*, *betucht*, *beducht* (*betuach* (?), von *botach*), sicher, zuverlässig, Vertrauen verdienend, discret, solvent . . . Avé-Lallemant, IV 524.

*Bocher.*

*Bocher*, Jew., 'youth, student,' from Hebr. *bachûr* 'youth.' Kluge, 36.

Der *Bächer*, *Bäger* (wetterau. Juden), angehender jüdischer Gelehrter, Student, clericus (v. hebr. *bachar*, auswählen: Erwählter) . . . Lehrer, besonders herumziehender jüdischer Kinderlehrer. Schmeller, I 195.

Der *Boocher*, in der Judensprache, der Junge, Knabe, auch *Bocker*, bei Manchen *Bucker*, vielleicht absichtlich auf das franz. bougre anspielend. Aus dem He. *bechor* der Erstgeborene, Chald. *bechir* und *buchar* . . . Bernd, 28.

Tendlau, 113 gives: *Bacher* (*bachur*) ein Jüngling, ausnahmsweise, der sich dem Studium des Talmuds widmet; zuweilen auch ein Lehrer, besonders auf dem Lande. This passed into Thieves' slang in the form of: *Bochur*, *Bacher*, *Bocher* (*bocher*, Pl. *bochurim*), der Student, der Ausstudirte, Ausgelernte, Verschlagene, der Beamte welcher die Kunst und Sprache des Gaunerthums wohl versteht. Avé-Lallemant, IV 526. It is derived from neo-Hebr. *bocher* (בָּחֵר), pl. *bachurim* (בָּחֻרִים), young man; the pl. *bachurim* is doubtless responsible for the sing. form *bacher*.

*Dalles.*

Der *Dalles* (Wetterau, Juden), Armuth, grösste Dürftigkeit, von hebr. *dallôth*, plur. von *dallah*, Armuth, aus *dalal*, schwach, gering seyn. Anders v. *Dalles*, das Todtenkleid. Schmeller, I 499.

*Dalles*, m., 'destruction, ruin,' Jew.; properly the Jewish winding-sheet worn on the great 'day of atonement' (hence orig. 'to wear the Dalles'); from Hebr. *talith*. According to others, the word is based on Hebr. *dallût* 'poverty.' Kluge, 51.

Kluge's derivation from *talles*, as *talith* is pronounced in J.G., is absurd, since the "Jewish winding-sheet" is worn on any other day as well. The real origin is neo-Hebr. דָּלִיּוּת 'poverty,' the J.G. and S.J.G. *dalles*. The Amsterdam translation (1755) of the Proverbs in J.G. changes the usual 'un' er soll vergessen sein armut' to 'un' soll vergessen sein dalles' (Grünbaum, 129). It is in common use in J.G. and S.J.G. in the sense of 'poverty, ruin,' and in S.J.G. *bedalles weren* means 'to get ruined.'

*Dallinger.*

*Dallinger*, henker; Grimm, II 700.

der *Dallinger*, -s, Pl. wie Sing.: Henker. Ein bereits im



Anfange des 16. Jahrh. in dem *liber vagatorum* vorkommendes Gaunerwort, aus dem von hebr. *tālāh* (תָּלָה) = aufhängen abgeleiteten rabbinischen *taljān* (תַּלְיָן) = Henker, Scharfrichter, woher jüdisch *taljen* = aufhenken. Weigand, I 303.

*Taljenen, Taljen, talchen, talgen, dolmen, tulmen* (tolo), henken; *Taljon, Talgener* und *Tallien* (Schinderspr.), der Henker, etc. . . . Avé-Lallemant, IV 613.

In J.G. *tole* is 'the Crucified, Christ'; in S.J.G. *taljen* is 'the executioner,' *tlie* 'the gallows.' Weigand's statement is correct, except that I cannot find any verb *taljen* either in J.G. or S.J.G.

#### *Dibbern.*

*döbern* = angelegentlich besprechen. Jüdisch-deutsch, eig. *dibbern*, aus *dibêr* (דִּבֶּר) = reden. das *Gedöber*, -s, Pl. wie Sing.: angelegentliche Besprechung . . . In der Wetterau, etc., das *Gediwver*, d. i. *Gedibber*. Weigand, I 539.

*dibbern, diwvern* (wetterau. Juden; von hebr. *dibêr*, reden), etwas angelegentlich besprechen. Schmeller, I 480.

*dibbern*, vb., Jew., 'to talk' (especially in a low voice), from Hebr. *dibbêr* 'to talk.' Kluge, 55.

I can find no trace of the word in J.G. or S.J.G.; it is to be regarded as a new formation from Hebr. דִּבֶּר in Thieves' slang: *dabern, dabbern, debbern, dibbern, medabber sein*, reden, sprechen. *Dibbur*, Wort, Rede, Spruch. Avé-Lallemant, IV 532.

#### *Dokes.*

Der *Dogges* (Franken), podex; Wetterau: *Douckes* (Judenwort); *Dôkes*. Schmeller, I 493.

*Dokes, Douches*, m., 'fundament,' a Jewish word, but of doubtful etymology; hardly from Hebr. *táchath* 'underneath.' Kluge, 58.

The J.G. and S.J.G. word for podex is *toches*, from Hebr. תַּחַת or תַּחַת 'the lower part'; hence the above meanings.

#### *Doufes.*

*Doufes*, m., 'prison,' Jew., from Hebr. *tafàs* 'to seize, take prisoner.' Kluge, 59.

The only word from the stem תָּפַס, *tofas* 'to seize, to imprison,' that is actually used in J.G. or S.J.G. is תַּפְסֵה, *tfise* 'prison.' Avé-Lallemant gives for Thieves' slang: *Tofes, Tofus*, der Arrestirte, Gefangene, Eingekerkerte; *T'fise*, das Gefängnisz, der Arrest; etc. The word is therefore to be regarded as taken from this source, but with a change of meaning.

*Flöten.*

*plete gehn*, auch wohl *flöten gehn* (Wetterau), sich aus dem Staube machen, vom hebr. *plētah* Flucht. Schmeller, I 463.

*flöten* in der Redensart *flöten gehn* = verloren gehn. Niederd. *fleuten gan*. Aus dem jüdisch-deutschen "pleite gehn" = flüchtig sich fortmachen, dessen *plēite* (ei spr. wie äi) das jüdische *plētō* (פֿלֶיטֶה) = "Flucht" ist von hebr. *palat* (פֿלֶט) = er ist entwischt. Weigand, I 477.

Grimm (III 1824) thinks the word is German: Weigand hält hinzu das jüdisch-deutsche *pleite gehn* sich fortmachen, in der gaunersprache bedeutet *blete* (*plethe*) *holchen* durchgehn, *blete scheften* verschwunden sein, andere dachten an nl. *pleiten gaan* vor gericht gehn, processieren und verderben. diesen fremden redensarten opfert man doch ungern die natürlich scheinende und schönere deutung aus dem sich verlierenden *flöten* laut. der ausdruck hat uns freilich einen gemeinen beischmack und es ist auffallend, dasz er nicht früher verwandt wird (i. e. before the second half of the 18th century). nie aber wird *bleten*, *pleten* gesagt, sondern *flöten* immer nach dem Instrument.

*Flöte*. In the idiom *flöten gehn* 'to come to nothing,' a LG. *fleuten* 'to flow' (OLG. *fliotan*) appears; it meant orig. (in the 18th cent.) 'to go through, run away.' Kluge, 93.

*flöten gehn*, verloren gehn, verschwinden. Wohl von dem Laut, den etwas die Luft sausend Durchschneidendes giebt. Sanders, I 469.

I must decide with Weigand as against the last three. Their arguments are untenable on account of the stereotyped phrase *flöten gehn*; it exists in the form *plete gehn* both in J.G. and S.J.G. Kannst *plete gehn*! = in die Flucht (*plētah*) gehn. *Plete machen* heiszt bankerott machen. Tendlau, 119. It is from the Hebrew פֿלֶיטֶה, *plete* 'escape.'

*Ganfen.*

*ganfen*, stehlen, mauseu, mundartlich, z. b. mrh., . . . Nassau, . . . hess., . . . götting., *gamsen*, osnabr. *ganfern*, nebst *ganfe* oder *gamfe* f. diebin, *ganfer*, *gamfer* m. dieb; in Posen *ganneff*, dem Juden nachgesprochen, der dieb, auch nl. *gannef*, vom hebr. *ganabh* גָּנַב, stehlen, dann in die gaunersprache, von da in den volksmund gekommen; schon im anfang des 16. jh. im liber vagatorum im rothwelschen vocab. *ganfen* stehlen. Grimm, IV, I, 1, 1219.

The other authorities do not differ substantially from Grimm; he states the case correctly, except that the word is not derived directly from גנב (which could give only *gonwen*), but from גנף, *ganef* 'thief.' Tendlau gives for J.G. the forms *gannew* 'thief,' *ganneven* 'steal.' The verb has in S.J.G. further developed into *ganwenen*.

*Gauner.*

*Gauner*, earlier *Jauner*, m., 'sharper, knave,' does not occur till the beginning of the last century; in the 15th and 16th cents. the professional swindlers at cards were called *Joner*, from the slang *jonen* 'to play,' the ultimate source of which is said to be Hebr. *jānā* 'to cheat.' Kluge, 108.

This is evidently a résumé of the long article on *Gauner* in Grimm, IV, I, 1, 1583 ff., which I omit on account of its length; there are certainly no related words in J.G. or S.J.G., and its J.G. origin is doubtful. For completeness' sake I repeat here a short story from Tendlau (357) which may have something to do with the word: *Jonah Mechaschschef! Um eine groszthuende und doch geringfügige Geschicklichkeit, Fertigkeit u. s. w. lächerlich zu machen. Jonah, der Zauberer! (mechaschscheph, hebr.). Ein gewisser Jonah, wie man sagt, aus einem kleinen Orte in der Nähe Frankfurts, gab sich für einen sehr geschickten Uhrmacher aus. Es gelang ihm auch immer, eine Uhr, die stehen geblieben, augenblicklich wieder in Gang zu bringen. Aber kaum hatte er sich entfernt, kaum war er, auf dem Wege nach Hause, bis vor das Thor gekommen, so blieb sie auch wieder stehen. Daher sagte man ihm spottweise nach, er setze jedesmal eine Fliege in die Uhr, durch deren Tritt das Räderwerk auf einige Minuten in Bewegung gesetzt werde.*

*Goi.*

*Goi* (hebr.), Mz. *Gojim* (jüdelnd): ein Nichtjude. Sanders, I 607.

Der *Gai*, Mz., -s, den Juden nachgebraucht, jeder Nichtjude, zunächst der Christ. Bernd, 77.

From Hebr. גוי 'a non-Jew, gentile.'

*Kaffer.*

*Kaffer*, m. als schimpfwort, z. b. studentisch, duckmäuser, fader mensch, knauser, auch schmuziger mensch im wörtlichen sinn, und bauer. eine schulmässige übertragung der kaffern im kaffer-

lande? schwab., rhein. für bauer, vielleicht aus der studentensprache. Grimm, V 25.

der *Kaffer*, -n, Pl. -n: Bauer. In der Gaunersprache und dann studentisch. Aus talmudisch oder rabbinisch der *kaphri* (כַּפְרִי) = Dorfbewohner, Bauer, abgeleitet von hebr. *kâphâr* (כָּפַר) = Dorf. Weigand, I 748.

*Kaffer*, mundartl. in Südd. Schimpfname für "Bauer" ... vergl. hebr. כָּפַר (*kafar*) Dorf, viell. mit Anlehnung an *Kaffer* (Caffre). Sanders, I 850.

*Kaffer* 'uneducated person,' prop. a student's term from Arab. *kâfir* 'unbeliever.' Kluge, 161.

Weigand is nearest to the truth. The word occurs in J.G., but not in S.J.G. "Das is e Kafre!" *kaphri*, ein Dorfbewohner, Bauer, vom bibl. *kaphar*, Dorf. Im Munde der Bauern selbst, auf welche das Wort übergegangen ist, lautet es *Kaffer*. Tendlau, 126. In Thieves' slang the word has many derivatives: *Kesar* (von *kophar*), *Kfar*, *Gefar*, *Gfar* (Hannov. hat allein *Kaf*, als Abbreviatur כ von כָּפַר *kephar* (ought to be *kophor*) Dorf), das Dorf. *Kaffer*, der Bauersmann, der Mann, Ehemann, gewöhnlich mit der Bedeutung der Geringschätzung, etc. ... Avé-Lallemant, IV 555. The similarity to *Kaffer*, *Caffre*, doubtless aided the adoption of the word by the students.

#### *Kapores.*

*capores* = zum Tode; todt, entzwei. zu Grunde gerichtet. Jüdische Aussprache des rabbinisch-hebr. die *kappôreth* (כַּפֹּרֶת) = Versöhnung, Sühnopfer, eig. Deckel der Bundeslade. Unsere heutige Bed. daher, weil am groszen Versöhnungstage mancher Jude einem Nichtjuden seine Sünden auferlegen wollte mit den Worten: "Sei du meine *kappôreth*!" d. i. mein Sühnopfer, was dann den Sinn hatte: Stirb du für mich zur Versöhnung mit Gott! Weigand, I 268. *kapôr*, gleichbedeutend mit *kapores*. Aus gemein-jüdisch *gebôre* (? !), welches das gemein-jüdische *kappôro* gelesene rabbinische *kappârâh* (כַּפְּרָה) = Versöhnung, Versöhnungsoffer, ein ebenso wie *kappôreth* gebrauchtes Wort und mit diesem von der nämlichen Wurzel [*kâphâr* (כָּפַר) = bedecken, im Piel *kipper* (כִּפֵּר) = die Schuld bedecken, vergeben, sühnen, entsündigen]. Ib. I 760.

*kapor*, *kapores*, in *kapôres* gehn, *kapôres* sein, zu grunde gehn, verloren sein. der ausdruck, entschieden für niedrig geltend,

ist dem jüdischen deutsch entlehnt, *kappōreth* f., sühnopfer, man hört auch noch *kapōr*. Grimm, V 187.

*kappores*, *kappores gehn*, zu Grunde gehn, verderben; aus d. JD., wo die Worte: du sollst mein *kapporo* werden, bedeuten, du sollst mir zur Versöhnung, als Sühnopfer dienen, du sollst sterben. Bernd, 114.

*kapore*, *kappores*, todt, zu nichte (jüd.-rabbinisch: *kapparah*, *kapporeth*, Versöhnung, Versöhnungsopfer, Sühnopfer; v. hebr. *kipper*, versöhnen, entsündigen). Schmeller, I 1268.

*kapōres* (hebr.), adv.: zu Grunde (gerichtet). Von dem jüd. Gebrauch, zur Vorbereitung auf das Versöhnungsfest, als eine "kaporoh" (gleichsam ein Sühnopfer) einen Hahn mit dem Wunsche, dasz alle Strafe, die man selbst verdient habe, diesen treffen möge, dreimal um den Kopf zu schlingen und dann zu schlachten. Sanders, I 866.

*kappores*, adj., 'broken, destroyed.' ModHG. only; according to the general acception it is not allied to ModHG. *kaput*, but is rather derived from Hebr. *kappārāh* 'reconciliation, atonement.' Kluge, 165.

Weigand's derivation of *kappores* from כַּפֹּרֶת is wrong, as it never means 'atonement,' but only 'covering of the ark, mercy seat.' His explanation of the origin of its meaning is truly barbarous, and must have been fished out of Eisenmenger. Sanders' explanation is the correct one; the Hebr. word כַּפֹּרֶת, pl. כַּפֹּרוֹת, gives both J.G. words *kapore* and *kappores*. "Wer mein Kappóre!" sei mein Sühnopfer, werde für mich dahingenommen! "Kappóre für kol Jisroel!" bei Erwähnung eines schlechten Menschen, der gestorben: "er sei ein Sühnopfer für ganz Israel!" Dann, um Etwas als werthlos, schlecht zu bezeichnen: "Vice Kappóre!" (gewöhnlich Futze Kappóre!) "an der Stelle eines Sühnopfers," was freilich zu erkennen gibt, dasz man nicht immer das Beste zum Sühnopfer genommen . . . Endlich ward es vom Volk überhaupt für verdorben gebraucht, z. B.: "Mach's nit kappóre!" ähnlich: *kaput* . . . Tendlau, 68.

In S.J.G. the word occurs in a number of locutions well illustrating its use: es töjg (Germ. taugt) ouf *kappores* 'it is good for nothing,' šlogen mit epes *kappores* 'to throw away as worthless.' *Kapor*, a shortened form of this, has become *kapöjr* in S.J.G. and means 'topsy-turvy.' The word is also used in Thieves' slang in many similar phrases (s. Avé-Lallemant, IV 553).



*Knassen.*

*knassen, knasten*, hart strafen, büßen lassen, auch zu grunde richten, . . . auch in der gaunersprache *knassen* strafen, *knasz* strafe, urtheil. das sind wertvolle reste eines alten wortes mit der bed. zermalmen, wie noch norw. *knasa* . . . Grimm, V 1357.

*knassen* = (mit Geld) strafen. Aus der Gaunerstrafe, wo aus talmudisch, rabbinisch *Knäs* (כָּנָס) = er hat gestraft, mit Strafe belegt, zum Tode verurtheilt. Weigand, I 818.

Cf. Sanders, I 949 f. "*Knas*," *Kenäs* (neuhebr., nach dem latein. *censio* gebildet) heisst eigentlich: Strafe, Busze; daher: "*Knas* geben," Strafe zahlen. Tendlau, 58. Cf. Avé-Lallemant, IV 559.

It is evident that Weigand, and not Grimm, is nearer to the truth.

*Kohl.*

der *Kohl* = langweiliges, auch dummes Geschwätz. Studentisch. Aus der Gaunersprache, in welcher *kôl* = Erzählung, Lüge, aus hebr. der *Kôl* (קוֹל) = Stimme, Gerücht, Schall. Weigand, I 835.

The J.G. origin is ignored elsewhere: s. Bernd, 137; Grimm, V 1581; Sanders, I 968; Kluge, 185 f. In J.G. and S.J.G. *kol* means only 'voice,' but in Thieves' slang (Avé-Lallemant, IV 561) it means also 'lie, simulation, deception.' The J.G. origin of the word is not beyond suspicion.

*Koscher.*

*kauscher*, rein, ächt, wie es sein soll, untadelig, ein jüdisches, chaldäisches wort. כֹּשֶׁר, קָשֶׁר (*kôschêr, kôschar*) recht, gesetzmässig; dazu *kauschern, koschern*, von christenhänden verunreinigte speisen, gefässe wieder rein machen. *kauscher* ist die aussprache der niederen Juden für *koscher* (kauscheres fleisch); es ist aber in die allgemeine sprache übergegangen, durch ganz Deutschland verbreitet, besonders *nicht kauscher*, nicht richtig, nicht geheur. Grimm, V 362.

*kausch, kauscher*, rein, echt, wie es seyn soll. Dieses Wort gehört wohl eher zum jüdischen *koscher*, als zum folgenden *keusch*, obschon die gl. a. 311.907: *nist chûski*, non est fas, gut fügen würde. *Koscher* ist das Fleisch des geschlachteten Thieres, wenn demselben die Schlundröhre nur zur Hälfte durchschnitten ist; wenn aber dieselbe ganz durchschnitten, ist es *trefa*. Schmeller, I 1303.

What is given in Grimm as an explanation of *kauschern* is as incorrect as Weigand's explanation of *kapores*. *Koschern* means to clean a vessel that has become ritually impure from any cause whatsoever. Otherwise the statements are correct. Cf. Weigand, I 846; Bernd, 140; Sanders, I 883; Kluge, 188. The word is of common occurrence in J.G., S.J.G. and Thieves' slang in the original and derived meanings. Cf. Tendlau, 96.

### *Matze.*

der *Matzen*, -s, Pl. wie Sing.; eigentlich der *Matze*, -ns, Pl. -n: dünner aus Wasser und Mehl bereiteter Osterkuchen der Juden. Bei Adelung fehlt das Wort, und Campe hat gegen den geläufigen Gebrauch die *Matze*, Pl. -n. 1482 der *matz* statt *matze*, und der *matzenkuch* statt *matzenkuoche* der Matzenkuchen. Aus der Sprache unserer Juden aufgenommen, wo *mazzo* (should be *mazze*), welches hebr. die *mazzâh* (מַצָּה) = ungesäuertes Brot, wie es die Juden zu Ostern essen. Weigand, II 48.

Grimm, VI 1770, gives der and die *Matze*, der Matzkuchen. Bernd, 171, has die *Matze* with an instructively absurd etymology and explanation. In Schmeller, I 1701, in addition to der *Matzen* is given *matzen*, *matzelen*, teigig, ungesalzen, fade schmecken.

*matzlich*, adj. Grimm, VI 1770, thinks that *matzricht*, *matzig*, schwach, unwert, thöricht is not derived from *Matze*.

*Matzen*, m., 'passover bread,' early ModHG., from Jewish *mazzo* (? should be *mazze*), Hebr. *mazzôth* (?), unleavened bread, whence also late MidHG., or rather early ModHG. *Masanze*, passover bread. Kluge, 230.

The J.G. and S.J.G. form is die *Matze*.

### *Mausche, Mauschel.*

"*mauschen*, *mauscheln*, still und unbemerkt dahin gehen"; von Delling. *täuscheln* und *mäuscheln*, sich mit heimlichen und unerlaubten Geschäftchen abgeben. Zaupser's Idiot., p. 51: "*mäuscheln*, allerley kleinen Handel treiben; a *Mauscherl*, ein Jude." "*mauschaln*, die Hände übervorthelend in einer Sache haben (vom hebr. *Môschel*, Herr, *maschal*, Herr seyn, herrschen); *Mouschel* seyn, jüdisch, Herr seyn, Gewalt haben." . . . Schmeller, I 1680.

*Mauschel*, m., spotname für einen Juden weitergebildet aus dem jüdischen namen Moses, in jüdisch-deutscher aussprache

*Mausche* oder *Mösche*, wie denn diese und verwandte formen als allgemeiner rufname für juden begegnen . . . die form *mauschel* bezeichnet in verächtlicher weise den juden, namentlich den schacherjuden . . . *mauscheln*, verb., wie ein schacherjude verfahren; im handeln: bair. *täuscheln* und *mäuscheln*, sich mit heimlichen und unerlaubten geschäftchen abgeben. Grimm, VI 1819 f.

*mauscheln*, vb., 'to act like a cheat,' lit. 'mosaizare'; allied to *Mausche*, equiv. to Hebr. *Möschâh* 'Moses.' Kluge, 231.

Cf. Bernd, 172; Sanders, II 265.

I propose another explanation: *Moschel*, from Hebr. מִשְׁלֵּל, means in J.G. and S.J.G. 'example, parable,' *lemoschel* 'for example.' This would become in German *mauschel*, as *Koscher* has become *Kauscher*. The frequent application of allegories and parables in the Talmud leads the Jews to recur to these every time they wish to impress a moral. At least, in S.J.G. the phrase *ich wil dir a moschel sagen* 'I shall tell you a story to suit your case' is of common occurrence. One need only run through Tendlauer's collection of proverbs to see that most of them are such *mescholim*, parables. The use of the word in earlier times is well illustrated in the following extract in Grünbaum (p. 106); it is from a prayer-book printed in 1725, at Frankfort: nit allein die תורה von die תלמידי חכמים hat ein קיום אפילו ir schlecht gemeine red, die משלים das sie reden, die sein ach nit vergebens. From this there is only a step to *mauscheln* as a characteristic of Jewish speech, and originally *mauscheln* means 'to speak like a Jew,' as, for example, in Heine's statement: "was wir nämlich in Norddeutschland mauscheln nennen, ist nicht anders als die eigentliche Frankfurter Landessprache, und sie wird von der unbeschnittenen Population eben so vortrefflich gesprochen, wie von der beschnittenen." From this were developed the meanings 'act like a Jew, haggle.' *Mausche*, Moses, may have aided the acceptance of this word.

#### *Meschugge.*

*meschugge*, adj., 'crazy,' from the equiv. Hebr. *meschuggâ*. Kluge, 235.

Cf. Schmeller, I 1680. This J.G. (also S.J.G.) word is correctly stated by Kluge as derived from Hebr. מְשֻׁגָּע 'maddened, mad.' Avé-Lallemant derives it incorrectly from the root *shogag* (IV 573).

*Moos.*

*Moos* für geld, im volksmunde, landschaftlich weit verbreitet . . . entstammt der gaunersprache und geht wol auf hebräischen ursprung zurück . . . jetzt auch umgedeutet *Moses* und die propheten haben, anlehnend an Luc. 16, 29. Grimm, VI 2521.

*Moos*. Volkssprache und nam. bursch.: Geld . . . nach Adellung; aus dem jüd.-deutsch. *Mesum* (Geld) verderbt?, vielmehr aus מָשָׁה = *maah*, oder nach gw. jüd. Aussprache *mooh* = Steinen und talmud.-chald.: Münze, Obolus. Sanders, II 1, 330. Cf. Bernd, 181.

In J.G. and S.J.G. *moes* (cf. Tendlau, 256), from Hebr. מָשָׁה, means 'money'; so too in Thieves' slang (Avé-Lallemant, IV 575).

*Schabbes.*

*Schabbes*, m., in gemein-jüdischer aussprache für sabbat. Grimm, VIII 1946.

*Schabbes* nach der jüdischen Aussprache des hebr. *schabbath*. Weigand, II 534.

Cf. Bernd, 246; Schmeller, II 353; Sanders, II 2, 874. From Hebr. שַׁבָּת, *schabbes* 'sabbath.'

*Schacher.*

*Schacher* (aus hebr. סַחַר, quaestus, lucrum), kleinhandel, besonders gewinnsüchtiger hausirhandel, gewöhnlich von den juden, in verächtlichem sinne gebraucht. Grimm, VIII 1959. *schachern*, verb. (aus hebr. סַחַר, *sachar*, handelnd umherziehen . . . Ib. 1961.

Cf. Weigand, II 536; Sanders, II 2, 876; Schmeller, II 364; Bernd, 246. The distinction between סַחַר and סַחֵר is nugatory, as it does not exist in J.G. or S.J.G. in these forms; the only words to be found there are *socher* (from סַחֵר), merchant, and *s-chore* (סַחֲרָה), merchandise; it is a new formation in Thieves' slang, where alone it has the opprobrious meaning. Avé-Lallemant, IV 593.

*Schächten.*

*schächten*, 1) nach jüd. Ritus = mit Durchschneidung der Luftröhre = schlachten (hebr. שָׁחַט). In der Mauschelsprache auch mit starkformigen Partic.: *geschochten*. Verallgemeint = schlachten. 2) übertr., übervorthellen, bluten lassen. Sanders, II 2, 877.

Cf. Grimm, VIII 1966; Weigand, II 538; Schmeller, II 365;

Bernd, 247. A new formation from *schochet* (שחט) 'butcher.' It has the derived meaning in Thieves' slang: Avé-Lallemant, IV 595.

#### *Schäkern.*

der *Schäker* = wer gerne schäkert. *schäkern* = muthwillig, neckisch, mit Lachen scherzen, wovon auch die *Schäkerei* ... Erster Aufzeichner des Verbums ist 1711 ..., wo "scheckern, tscheckern" ... Es kommt aus der Juden- und Gaunersprache, wo *schäker* = Lüge, *schäkern* = lügen, jenes, wovon dieses abgeleitet wurde, aus hebr. der *scheker* (שקר) = Lüge, Trugrede, Lügner ..., von hebr. *schakar* (שקר) = lügen, täuschen, und noch jüdisch gewöhnlich *schakren* = lügen, falsch reden. Weigand, II 542. Grimm, VIII 2055 is but a repetition of Weigand.

Cf. Schmeller, II 367; Kluge, 300. Sanders, II 2, 885 does not mention the Hebr. origin. In J.G. and S.J.G. *scheker* means 'lie' and *schakren* 'a liar'; no verbs occur, hence Weigand's and Grimm's statements must be corrected accordingly. Cf. also Avé-Lallemant, IV 595.

#### *Schicker.*

*schicker*, adj., in md. und nd. mundarten gebräuchlich, betrunken. jüdischdeutsch aus hebr. שׂוֹכֵר ... Grimm, VIII 2657.

Cf. Bernd, 22, 252.

#### *Schicksel.*

*Schicksel*. bezeichnung für ein judenmädchen, ursprünglich von den juden für christenmädchen (*schikzah* zu שׂוֹאָה = abscheu, gräuel) angewendet. Grimm, VIII 2664.

*Schicksel*, n., 'young girl'; ModHG. only, formed from Hebr. and Jew. *schikzah* 'Christian girl,' Hebr. *schikkáz*, lit. 'abomination.' Kluge, 306.

Cf. Sanders, II 2, 916; Schmeller, II 364; Weigand, II 570.

Grimm's statement is the correct one: *schikse* is a new formation from *schekez* (שׂוֹאָה) 'abomination.' In S.J.G. *schejgez* (as *schekez* is pronounced) and *schikse* may mean also 'urchin, buxom girl,' respectively, without a depreciatory sense. Cf. Avé-Lallemant, IV 598.

#### *Schlamassel.*

der *Schlamassel*, -s, Pl. wie Sing.: zukommender verdrieszlicher Zustand, oder böser Zustand, in welchen man geräth. Bayer. auch die *Schlamassen*. Gebildet, wie es scheint, aus



und nach altfranz. *esclamasse*, ital. der *schiamázso*, = Geschrei, Lärm, welches aus einem mittellat. das *exclamâtium* (?) = lautes Geschrei, von lat. *exclamatus*, dem Part. des Perf. im Passiv von lat. *exclamare* = ausrufen, laut schreien. Weigand, II 581.

Der und das *Schlámássel*, die *Schlámássen*, böser, verdrieszlicher Handel oder Zustand, in den man geräth (wol das ital. *schiamazzo* von *schiamare* aus *exclamare*). Schmeller, II 522.

*Schlimmassel* (more correctly *Schlimmasel*) in J.G. means 'ill luck,' it being composed of Germ. *schlimm* and neo-Hebr. שָׁמַל 'luck' (orig. star); this is in contradistinction to the common greeting 'masseltow' (מַסֵּלְטוֹ) 'good luck to you.' The word has the same meaning in S.J.G., although *schlimm* does not exist in it as an independent word. 'Good luck' (when not a greeting) is in S.J.G. *dobre* (Pol. 'good') *masel*; by the side of this the strength of *schlimmassel* is made indisputable. *Schlimmasel* in S.J.G. corresponds to the Germ. *Pechvogel*, and has been adopted in this sense in White Russian. *Schlemihl*, variously guessed at as a biblical name, is probably only a corruption of *Schlimmassel* in the latter sense. Cf. Avé-Lallemant, IV 571.

#### *Schmus.*

der *Schmu*, -es, -s, ohne Pl.: durch Schlaueheit erlangter Gewinn. Erst bei Adelung. Niederd. *smu*. Jüdisch-deutsch wol aus hebr. die *schmúáh*. Weigand, II 608. der *Schmus*, -es, Pl. -e: Gerede eines Unterhändlers zur Ueberredung; leeres Gerede; Geld als Ueberredungslohn beim Handel. Davon: *schmusen* = (viele Worte machend) reden, dann auch s. v. a. zu Uebervortheilung reden, wovon weiter der Schmuser. Jüdisch-deutsch. Der *Schmus* ist von hebr. *schmúóth* (שְׂמוּעוֹת) = Erzählungen, welches unsre Juden *schmuoss* aussprechen. Es ist diesz der Pl. des hebr. die *schmúáh* (שְׂמוּעָה) = Nachricht, Botschaft, welches von hebr. *scháma* (שָׁמַע) = hören. Ib. 609 f.

*Schmus*, m., 'talk, chaffering'; ModHG. only, from Hebr. *schémúóth* 'news, tales'; hence Du. *smousen* 'to chaffer'? Kluge, 317.

Cf. Schmeller, II 559; Sanders, II 2, 981. Not in Avé-Lallemant. Common in J.G. and S.J.G. in the sense of 'talk.'

#### *Schofel.*

*schofel*, Adj. u. Adv.: geringhaltig, bedauerlich, schlecht, armselig. Davon der *Schofel* (Bürger) = armselige Sache oder

Sachen. Jenes Adj., in unsrer Schriftsprache erst nach 1750, ist das von unsern Juden *schofel* gelesene, aber gewöhnlich, als wenn *schôfêl* (שׂוֹפֵל) geschrieben wäre, *schoufel* gesprochene [weshalb auch bei hochdeutsch Redenden *schau fel*] talmudische *schâfêl* (שָׂפֵל) = niedrig, gering, nicht geachtet, das Part. von hebr. *schâfêl* (שָׂפֵל) = niedrig gemacht werden, sinken, gedemüthigt werden. Weigand, II 628.

*schofel*, adj., 'paltry'; ModHG. only, formed from Hebr. *schâfêl* 'low.' Cf. Sanders, II 2, 998; Schmeller, II 386; Bernd, 274; Avé-Lallemant, 603.

Weigand's discussion is superfluous; it is simply the adj. שָׂפֵל *schofel* which occurs in J.G., but rarely in S.J.G.

#### *Schote.*

*Schaute*, m., narr, geck, spazmacher; schlechter niedriger mensch; jüdisch-deutsch aus hebr. (rabbinisch) שׂוֹפֵל 'narr'... auch in der form *schaude*, *schode*, *schote*... Grimm, VIII 2378.

*Schote*, *Schaude*, m., 'simpleton'; ModHG. only, formed from Hebr. *schôlêh* 'foolish.' Kluge, 321.

Cf. Weigand, II 634; Schmeller, II 485; Avé-Lallemant, IV 603.

The first is the correct statement.

#### *Stusz.*

der *Stusz*, Gen. des *Stusses*, Pl. *Stusse*: lächerliche Narrheit, Posse, Narrenstreich, Spasz. Jüdisch-deutsch und zwar ist es das von unsern Juden *Schtuss* ausgesprochene rabbinisch-jüdische *schâtâh* (שָׂטוּחַ) = Narrheit, Unsinnigkeit, von rabbinisch-jüdisch *schâtâh* (שָׂטוּחַ) = ein Narr werden, unsinnig sein, im Talmud auch s. v. a. sich närrisch stellen, Späße machen. Weigand, II 850.

Cf. Sanders, II 2, 1262; Schmeller, II 791; Avé-Lallemant, IV 604. Common to J.G. and S.J.G.

#### *Trefe.*

*trefe*: nach dem jüdischen Religionsgesetz unerlaubt gegessen zu werden. Jüdisch, eig. = beim Schächten gerissenes (nicht scharf durchgeschnittenes). Es ist das hebr. die *trephah* (טְרֵפָה) = von wilden Thieren Zerrissenes, abgeleitet von *taraf* (תָּרַף) = zerfleischen, zerreißen. Schon ins Mhd. entlehnt, wo 1376 *trefant*, 1426 *treffant*. Weigand, II 923.

Cf. Schmeller, I 650.

*Zores.*

der *Zores*, in der Biegung unverändert: ein Durcheinander, ein Wirrwarr; ein Durcheinander von Menschen; allerlei geringes Volk durcheinander, Gesindel. Jüdisch-deutsch. Aus dem von unsern Juden *zôrës* [d. i. eig. *zôrös*] gesprochenen hebr. *zârôt* (צרות) = Bedrängnisse, Nöthe, dem Plural des von unsern Juden *zôrë* gesprochenen hebr. die *zârâh* (צרה) = Bedrängnis, Noth, von *zârar* (ציר) = drängen, anfeinden. Weigand, II 1187.

*Zores*, *Zorus*, m., 'confusion'; ModHG. only, from Jewish *zores* 'oppression.' Kluge, 410.

Cf. Schmeller, II 1149. Not in Avé-Lallemant.

In J.G. and S.J.G. *zores* means 'trouble.'

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBIA, Mo.

LEO WIENER.

## NOTES.

### CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO LEWIS AND SHORT.

In imitation of the example set by others who have published in this Journal (VIII 345-6; XIV 216 ff., 362 ff.) lists of corrections and additions to the Latin dictionary of Lewis and Short, and in the hope of rendering some slight aid to the reviser, when it shall be deemed possible to undertake a revision of the work, the following *addenda et emendanda*—the accumulation of several years—have been brought together. From the list a considerable number have been rejected, on finding that the necessary change had already been made in the Latin Dictionary for Schools.

It is to be hoped that the next edition of the lexicon will treat the Vulgate with more consistency. Among the following will be found examples sufficient to prove that words and meanings found in the Vulgate are often inadequately treated, occasionally omitted. A cursory reading of a respectable fraction of the whole is enough to bring to light no small number of such cases.

Another class of corrections given below will clearly show that the whole subject of Roman topography needs careful revision; many of the articles in question have survived from one edition to another, and remain as monuments of the Rome of Nardini and Nibby, of Bunsen and Becker, carefully preserved where we wish least of all to find a museum of antiquities—in a dictionary for general use.

To mark ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in all cases may be unnecessary, but a comparison with Keller and Holder's Index to Horace shows that even in the case of the most familiar authors there is room for improvement in the use of the asterisk. Thus, e. g., the following words should be marked '\* Hor.': *bilibris*, 1. *blatta*, *castellum* I. A. (dele "al."), 2. *catellus*, *cultellus*, etc.

*abra.* Omitted; = ἀβρα, *a favorite maid*, Vulg. Judith 8, 32.

*Abraham.* Add the form *Abrahamus*, Prisc. 5, 2, 11, p. 644; Neue<sup>2</sup>, I, 583, 585, 587. Also *Abramus*, Hieron. Euseb. Chron. I, 16, 1.

*absto.* Remove \*; for "v. n." read 'v. n. and a.' Add ref. to Plaut. Trin. 2, 1, 30 (264).

*adhuc* II G. fin. The ref. to Tac. Agr. 29 does not belong under this head, but under C.; v. Andresen ad loc. and cf. Agr. 37 init.—Id. II A. fin. For Cic. Att. 7, 2 read 7, 12, 1, and the passage should not be cited as an example of *adhuc* referring to past time, because the tense is epistolary.—Id. II C. Classify the examples according to the time referred to: *present*, all but the following: *past*, Liv. 33, 49, 7; Tac. A. 1, 8 fin.; id. H. 2, 44, 73; Suet. Aug. 56, 69; Curt. 8, 6, 18; in orat. obl. Tac. A. 1, 17 and 59; H. 4, 17; *future*, Plin. Ep. 4, 13, 1 [add 2, 19, 9].

*Aeneas*, voc. *Aenēā*. Add Verg. Aen. 10, 229; Tib. 2, 5, 39.

*aeneator*. Add the form *āenātor*, Amm. 16, 12, 36; Com. Lud. Saec. 88.

*aeternus* II A. fin. "Esp. of Rome: aeterna urbs." A little more definite information might be given as to the use of the phrase, thus: first in Tibullus, 2, 5, 23; then Ov. F. 3, 72; Frontin. Aq. 88 init.; not frequent until Amm.; cf. 14, 6, 1; 15, 7, 1; 16, 10, 14; Auson. Epigr. Fast. 1, 1; 2, 3; 3, 1; Symm. Ep. 3, 55; 10, 34, 38, etc.; also on coins and in inscrr. and constitutions of the emperors (Cod. Theod. 11, 2, 2; 14, 1, 3, etc.); official from the time of Hadrian. [A paper on this subject by the author of these notes will appear in the next volume of the Transactions of the American Phil. Assoc.]

*alluo*. Wrongly described as neuter.

*amburo* II B. Add Val. Max. 8, 1, Ambust. 1, tit.

*annoto* II B. Some reff. to Plin. Ep. and Pan. belonging properly under I A. and B. have been set down under this head.

*Areopagus*. Classify examples according as they are used of the hill and of the court: of the *hill*, Cic. Div. 1, 25, 54; Varr. L. L. 7, §19; Vulg. Act. 17, 19 sqq. [add Val. Max. 5, 3 Ext. 3 fin.]; of the *court*, Cic. Off. 1, 22, 75 [add Rep. 1, 27, 43; N. D. 2, 29, 74]; Sen. Tranq. 3 fin. (5, 1 Haase) [add Val. Max. 2, 6, 4; id. 8, 1, Ambust. 2]; Plin. 7, 56, 200. The divided form *Areos* (or *Areios*) *pagus* is common enough in recent editions to deserve a place.

*Argiletum*. The old description (following Forcellini) should give place to the modern view: 'A street in Rome, joining the Subura with the Forum Romanum, which it entered between the Curia and the Basilica Aemilia'; v. Richter in Baumeister, 1469 [Iw. Müll., Hdb. 3, 802]; Lanciani, Anct. Rome, 183.



*assimulatio*. No provision is made for the meaning *fiction* in Fav. Eul. ad Somn. Scip. (v. Georg., s. v.).

*belligero*. Asterisk should be placed before Liv. 21, 16, 4.

*bidens* II B. For a much better explanation of *bidens hostia* than that usually given in the dictionaries, v. A. Nehring in Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 1893, 1, 64.

*caedes*. Insert arch. nom. *caedis* (v. Georges, Wortformen).

*Capena* II B. *Porta Capena* should be detached from the article in which it stands, and given a place by itself. However the gate may have received the name, it was not from the Etruscan town of that name. Dele "in the eastern district"; also dele "now *Porta S. Sebastiano*," an ancient blunder, handed down through Forcellini, and still retained in the 8th ed. (1884) of Tischer's and the 3d ed. (1881) of Heine's Cic. Tusc. Disp. (v. 1, 7, 13, where the mention of the tomb of the Scipios makes the mistake sufficiently obvious).

1. *capitulum* II C. Add the mg. *sum and substance, chief point*, Vulg. Heb. 8, 1.

*cogo* II B. (β) with inf. Add some reff. to Cicero, e. g. Rosc. Am. 49, 143 init. (other exx. from Cic. and Caes. in the Dict. for Schools).

*compono* II A. 4 a. For Plin. Ep. 9, 9, 1 read 9, 13, 1.

*confundo* I B. 2 b. Add to *make ashamed, put to shame*, Vulg. Rom. 5, 5; pass., Is. 45, 16, 17; Jer. 2, 26; 6, 15; 8, 12; Heb. 2, 11; 11, 16.

*constabilio*. Add Lucr. 2, 42.

*contubernalis*. Add a few reff. to Plin. Ep.: 1, 2, 5; 2, 13, 5; 4, 4, 1; 6, 13, 11; 10, 4, 1.

*contubernium* I B. 1. The fact that the word is used even of women should be noticed; e. g. Plin. Ep. 3, 3, 3, of a boy in the *contubernium* of his mother; id. 4, 19, 6 (niece and aunt); id. 7, 24, 3 (grandson and grandmother).

*convicium* II D. Distinguish between *reviling* and *vigorous censure* (without abuse); cf. Forc. and Georges, s. v. II; Tac. Agr. 22.

*decet, decenter* fin. For "Cic. Caes." read 'Cic. Caec.'

*delicatus* II B. 2. *vah delicatus*, Plaut. Mil. 4, 1, 37 (984) should be altered to *vah, delicatu's* (Ritschl), and the phrase explained, with Brix<sup>4</sup>, as the equivalent of *delicias facis*; cf. Most, 947. Here belongs also *ubi tu's delicata*, Rud. 465, which is placed above, A. fin. (cf. Sonnenschein, Rud., l. c.).

*ementior.* The translation "to feign being any one," given for Plaut. Trin. 4, 2, 143 (985), although in agreement with Georges and Brix<sup>4</sup>, is in flat contradiction with the plot of the play.

2. *foedus* II A. Add a few reff. from Vulg., e. g. *pepigit Dominus foedus cum Abram*, Gen. 15, 18; *ib.* 17, 2, 7, etc.; Is. 28, 18.

*Gesoriācum* (or *-ācum*) should be inserted.

*glandium.* The definition "a delicate kernel or glandule in meat" needs to be supplemented: '*particularly the glands in the throat of swine* (cf. the throat-sweetbreads of veal and lamb)'; cf. Forc.: *tuberosus callosusque globus in cervice et faucibus apro-rum, et suum*; Georges, "Drüsenstück"; so Brix<sup>4</sup> on Capt. 4, 4, 7 (915). The translation of *glandionida* should be altered to correspond.

*glandulae* I. Add: *tonsillae in homine, in sue glandulae*, Plin. 11, 37, 66, §175.—Id. II = *glandium*. Omit "the neck-piece, delicate bits, esp. of pork." Mart. 3, 82, 20.

*Hiberus.* For "v. Iberus" read 'v. Hiberes I A. 1,' there being no article under the former, but only a reference back again to the latter.

*hir.* We should not be told that the word is from *χεῖρ*.

*honoro*, init. For "cf. honeste" read 'cf. honesto.'

*Iceni* are wrongly placed in the modern Kent, instead of Norfolk and Suffolk.

*Ilia* I. For Ov. F. 2, 383; 598 read Ov. F. 2, 598; cf. 383 (*Silvia*, Merkel and Peter).

*Illiberi.* Two places of the same name, one in Gaul and one in Baetica, are confused. The passage in Liv. cited (21, 24, 1) refers to the former.

*impossibilis.* Add Vulg. Mat. 19, 26; Luc. 1, 37; Heb. 6, 4; no reff. to Vulg. being given.

*ininterpretabilis.* For Heb. 5, 71 read 5, 11.

*insinuatō* II A. It should be made clear that this is only a rhetorical term. Add Macr. Somn. Scip. 1, 2, 4; other reff. in Forcellini.

*intendo, intentus, P. a.* No provision is made for the const. with *in* and acc., Liv. 22, 15, 1; 2, 33, 6; 29, 33, 1; also with *ad* and acc., Caes. B. G. 3, 26, 2; Cic. Phil. 11, 9, 22; with *adversus* and acc., Liv. 24, 10, 4; with *in* and abl., Caes. B. G. 3, 22, 1.

*invasio*, "post-class. for *incursio, aggressio*." Omit *aggressio*, which is also unclassical, and in its own place is cited only from Apuleius; Georges has other reff., but to still later writers.

*inveho* I B. The medial use of the pres. ptcp. without *se* should not be overlooked; e. g. illo Pacuviano invehens alitum anguim curru, Cic. Rep. 3, 9, 14; natantibus invehens beluis, id. N. D. 1, 28, 78.

*itinerarius* II, *itinerarium*. Add the meaning *an itinerary, a list of stations* on the imperial roads, with distances; e. g. Itin. Antonini, Itin. Hierosolymitanum, Itin. Alexandri.

*laridum*. Add the adj. *laridus*, and transfer to it the ref. to Plaut. Men. 1, 3, 27 (210); v. Fowler's Appendix, p. 187. To the noun add the mg. *salt pork*; v. Forc. ("carne porcina salata") and Georg. ("Pökelfleisch").

*Liberalia*. For "v. 3. Liber, II" read 'v. 2. Liberalis.'

*Litāna*. *Litāna* acc. to Weissb. on Liv. 23, 24, 7; Tischer-Sorof on Cic. Tusc. Disp. 1, 37, 89.

*magnalia*. Add ref. to Vulg. 2 Mach. 3, 34.

*mammeatus*. For "Plin. Poen." read 'Plaut. Poen.'

*manceps* II B. Plin. Ep. 2, 14, 4: note Keil's reading and punctuation of the passage cited.

*memoror*. Add: with *de* and abl., Heb. 11, 22; for Jer. 31, 14 read 31, 34; add (w. gen.) Heb. 8, 12; for Eccl. read Eccli.

*Messallinus*. This spelling proved by the Com. Lud. Saec. 152.

*Mogontiācum*. Add: or *-ācum* (latter Kiepert).

*molaris* I fin. Misprint: *deus* for *dens* (Vulg. Judic. 15, 19).

*motorius*. Add: subst. *motoria* (sc. *fabula*); cf. Prisc. 2, 50.

*Mugionia*. Substitute 'the chief gate of early Rome, on the northeast side of the Palatine'; cf. Richter in Baumeister, 1442 [Iw. Müller, Hdb. 3, 751]; Middleton, 1, 118, 167.

1. *ne* I, 2 *a*, *ne* . . . *quidem*. The meanings 'not . . . either,' 'also not,' 'certainly not,' should be duly recognized; cf. Cic. Tusc. Disp. 1, 8, 15 fin., 16 bis, 36, 88 fin., and a host of other examples; e. g. id. Fin. 2, 26, 82 and 27, 88; Div. 1, 35, 77; Liv. 21, 18, 11; Sen. Const. Sap. 1, 2; id. Ben. 2, 18, 5.

*obtineo* II fin., with *ut* or *ne*. Add the definition *to carry one's point*, with ref. to Liv. 22, 27, 10; more references in Georg. III B. *a*.

*occino* I. The mg. "*sing inauspiciously*" does not suit the passage quoted from Liv. 10, 40, 14, where it is clearly a favorable omen: quo laetus augurio consul, etc. In the quotation from Val. Max. (Paris) 1, 4, 2 the words *occinantes* and *corvi* should change places (Kempf).

*offendo* II E. fin. For Suet. Aug. 8, 9 read 89.

*pacisco* B. 3, *pactum*. To reff. to Vulg. add Gen. 17, 7, 9 sqq. *paeniteo* I B. init. Add mg. *be dissatisfied*, the first example cited (Liv. 22, 12, 10) showing this mg.

*Palatium* A. fin. Add: plur. *herbosa Palatia*, Tib. 2, 5, 25.

*pars* I 9. For v. *virilis* II. 2 read I C. 2.

*pensito* II B. fin. For Plin. Ep. 4, 15, 9 read 4, 15, 8.

*pilentum*. Ref. to *petorrita* should be *petorritum*.

*pluo*. In the arrangement of the examples no sufficient care has been taken to separate the impersonal constructions from the personal. Adopting a new set of subdivisions (after Georges), rearranging the examples where the present plan leads to confusion, and adding others, we have: I. Lit. A. Impersonal. 1. absol. . . . 2. with abl.: *lapidibus*, Liv. 1, 31, 1; 7, 28, 7; 21, 62, 5-6; 23, 31, 15; 25, 7, 7; 26, 23, 5; 30, 38, 9; 35, 9, 3; 39, 22, 3; *lapideo imbri*, id. 30, 38, 8; *terra . . . creta . . . lapidibus*, Aug. Civ. Dei 3, 31 med.; *creta et . . . sanguine*, Liv. 24, 10, 7; *lacte et sanguine*, etc., Plin. 2, 56, 57, §147; *lacte*, Liv. 27, 11, 6; *carne*, id. 3, 10, 6; *gutta*, Mart. 3, 47, 1. 3. with acc.: *lapides pluere*, Liv. 28, 27, 16 (*lapide*, Madv.; Weissb. suggests that this may be an example of the personal const.); *terram*, id. 35, 21, 4 (abl. Madv.); *sanguinem*, id. 40, 19, 2 (abl. Madv.); *ignem et sulphur*, Vulg. Luc. 17, 19. 4. doubtful whether abl. or acc.: Liv. 10, 31, 8 (not 33, 8); Cic. Div. 2, 27, 58.—B. Personal. 1. absol.: v. Georg. for examples from Vulg. and the fathers. 2. with acc.: *laqueos*, Vulg. Ps. 10, 7; *pluitque dominus grandinem*, Exod. 9, 23; *panes*, ib. 16, 4; *pluam . . . grandinem*, ib. 9, 18; *sulphur et ignem*, Gen. 19, 24. Georges also quotes Ambros. Ep. 64, 1, as showing the personal const. with abl.; but the context shows that Ambrose is using an indecl. form, and hence doubtless the Vulg. const. with acc.—II. Transf. . . . In the passage from Stat. Silv. (1, 6, 10) the v. l. *velaria linea* for *bellaria adorea* should be noticed.

*polliceor*. The fact that the fut. inf. const. is the regular one, and the pres. inf. almost confined to the colloquial phrase *dare polliceri*, should be distinctly mentioned; v. Krebs, Antib.<sup>6</sup> II, p. 290.

*Porthaon* should be inserted with cross-ref. to *Parthaon*; Plaut. Men. 5, 1, 45 (745), where the correction *Parthaone* is due to Camerarius.

*portio* I. Add: pro virili portione = pro virili parte, Tac. Agr. 45; Hist. 3, 20; v. *virilis* I C. 2.

*possibilis*. Add Vulg. Mat. 19, 26; Marc. 9, 22.

*potis* II B. The explanation of *nihil mihi fuit potius* (sic B. and K.) in Cic. Rep. 6, 9, 9 (Somn. Sc. 1) = "*I had nothing more important, nothing more urgent to do*," is certainly weak compared with *potius* = *antiquius* ("erwünschter," Meissner).

*praeuro* II B. To the one ref. to Plin. add: *praeusti artus*, Liv. 21, 40, 9.

*publicus* I B. 1. By misprint *publicus*.

*reconmentor*, 'to recall, recollect,' should not be omitted; Plaut. Trin. 4, 2, 67 (912).

*restringo* II. In cit. from Lucr. for *restricta* read *restringa*.

1. *rudis* II (8). Examples enough of the const. with *ad* are quoted to disprove the remark "very rare"; v. Wölfflin on Liv. 21, 25, 6: "eine nicht seltene Konstruktion." Substitute for "very rare" 'not in Cic. or Caes.' Krebs, *Antib.*<sup>6</sup> II, p. 476. [4 times in Curt., v. Vogel on 6, 6, 9.]

*sabbatismus*. Add Vulg. Hebr. 4, 9.

*sanctificatio*. Neither L. and S. nor Forc. nor Georg. recognize the mg. *sanctuary, temple*, which the word has (as translation of *ἁγίασμα*) in Vulg. 1 Mach. 1, 23, 38 sqq.; 6, 7, 51; cf. Is. 60, 13; Thren. 2, 7.

*sibilus* I (8), Lucr. 5, 1382. For *calamorum sibila* read *zephyri, cava per calamorum, sibila*, to accord with Lach. and Munro.

*spurcificus*. The single occurrence in Plaut. Trin. 4, 1, 7 (826) surely does not justify the translation "*obscene*." The word does not differ in mg. from *spurcus*; just as *laetificus* = *laetus* in Early Latin; cf. Tischer-Sorof and Heine on Cic. Tusc. Disp. 1, 28, 69.

*struix, icis*, should be *icis*; v. Brix<sup>4</sup> on Plaut. Men. 1, 1, 26 (102).

*substantia*. Add: III. *firm trust, confidence*; in hac substantia gloriae, Vulg. 2 Cor. 11, 17; ib. 9, 4; si tamen initium substantiae eius usque ad finem firmum retineamus, Heb. 3, 14; ib. 11, 1; Ps. 38, 8.

*tergum, tergus*. Add the arch. form *tegrus, oris*, Plaut. Capt. 4, 3, 2 (902); 4, 4, 7 (915); Pseud. 1, 2, 64 (198).

*testamentum*. By a strange oversight Forc., Georg., L. and S. omit the scriptural mg. *covenant*; e. g. memor fuit in saeculum testamenti sui, Vulg. Ps. 104, 8; ib. 105, 45; 110, 5; 1 Mach. 2, 27, 50; 4, 10; Act. 3, 25; Rom. 9, 4; Eph. 2, 12; Hebr. 8, 6; 12, 24; 13, 20. Also in a non-religious sense *agreement*, 1 Mach. 1, 12.



*thermopōto* should be  $\delta$ ; on quantity and a more plausible derivation v. Brix<sup>4</sup> on Plaut., l. c. (Trin. 1014).

*timor* I A. fin. For "with *in* and abl." read 'with *a* and abl.'; add also: with *e* and abl., et propius ex legato timor agitabat, Tac. Agr. 16.

*undecimviri* has been omitted; cf. Nep. Phoc. 4, 2 traditus est undecimviris, quibus ad supplicium more Atheniensium publice damnati tradi solent.

*vastificus* may be simply = *vastus*; cf. Tischer-Sorof and Heine on Cic. Tusc. Disp. 2, 9, 22.

*Velabrum*. Not "*a street in Rome on the Aventine Hill*." Cf. Forc.: vicus Romae olim celebris, iuxta Aventinum montem. Alii erat in foro boario, etc. This unfortunate connection with the Aventine lingers on in the commentaries; e. g. Heindorf, Krüger, Schütz, Breithaupt on Hor. Sat. 2, 3, 229. That it was more than a street is shown by Tibullus 2, 5, 33, At qua Velabri regio patet; and were there no other evidence, this passage alone would show that the Velabrum was in earlier times often under water. So also Prop. 4 (5), 9, 5-6; Ov. F. 6, 405-6. How far the quarter extended towards the south is uncertain, but even if it reached to the *vicus Publicius* of the Aventine, the hill would merely mark the southern limit of the Velabrum. We would suggest the following: '*A quarter of Rome lying under the western slope of the Palatine and adjoining the Forum Boarium*'; in early times the whole of the low ground between the river and the three hills, Capitoline, Palatine, Aventine'; v. Middleton, 1, 171, 221; Richter in Baumeister, 3, 1495-6 [or Iwan Müller, Hdb. 3, 844-5].

*Velia*. The definition "*an elevated part of the Palatine Hill at Rome*" is far from lucid; substitute '*a ridge between the Palatine and Esquiline Hills at Rome*, one of the original seven hills; cut away by Hadrian to make room for his temple of Venus and Rome'; v. Middleton, 1, 220; Richter in Baumeister, 3, 1443, 1489 [Iw. Müller, Hdb. 3, 753, 835]; Mommsen, R. G. 1, 50.

#### *Addendum.*

*aeternus* II A. Correct the reference to Cod. Theod. 10, 16, 1 (Forc. and Key 11, 16, 1) to 14, 4, 6 (Haenel).

## BRIEF NOTES ON PLAUTUS, TERENCE AND HORACE.

## I.

Edepól Libertas lépida 's, quae numquám pedem  
Volústi in nauem cum Hércule una inponere.

—Rudens 489-90.

Sonnenschein's comment, in his edition of the Rudens (Oxford, 1891, p. 119), is as follows: "An allusion to some lost myth about Herakles. Lucian (De mercede conductis, 23) says that *Libertas* never enters the house of a rich man." Without denying that there may be a 'lost myth' in the case, I take *Hercule* here as Hercules, the god of wealth, used as a name for a very rich man, as in the Mostellaria (v. 984), where Tranio is described as a slave who could "waste the revenues of even Hercules," or perhaps "of even a Hercules":

Tranio: is uel Hérculi contérere quaestum suóm potest.

## II.

The following fragment (p. 75 of Winter's edition) may be added to the scanty statements of Plautus regarding his attitude toward things political:

Néque ego ad mensam públicas res clámo neque legés crepo.

## III.

Nostrámne, ere, uis nutricem, quae nos éducat  
Abálienare a nóbis?

—Trinummus 512.

Stasimus is begging his master not to give away the farm, which is their only source of livelihood—the *nutricem quae nos educat*. The expression sounds like a homely stock phrase, and naturally recalls Cato's saying (in Varro):

Educit obstetrix. Educat nutrix. Instituit paedagogus. Docet magister.

## IV.

In aúrem utramuis ótiose ut dórmias.

—Heauton. 342.

Compare Ben Jonson's rendering in his 'Masque of Oberon':

"1 Satyr.—They have ne'er an eye  
To wake withal,

2 Satyr.—Nor sense I fear;  
For they sleep in either ear."

## V.

vitreamque Circen.

—Odes, I 17. 20.

Commentators deal inadequately with this phrase, as they attach to *vitrea* only the idea of brilliancy (sometimes magical brilliancy). A sentence of Publilius Syrus completes the meaning satisfactorily:

Fortuna vitrea est: tūm cum splendet frangitur.

The notion of brilliancy is thus supplemented by that of fragility and consequent deceitfulness, and *vitrea* is accordingly most appropriate in conjunction with *Circe* (see A. J. P. XV 1. 80). Coleridge saw the difficulty of interpreting *vitrea*, though without perceiving the double idea involved in its solution, and queried in his manuscript note in his copy of Horace: "Does this epithet imply the frailty of Circe? Or is it an Hyperbole like 'transparent Helena' of Shakspeare? Possibly H., by comparing the enchantress to an artificial production that seemed almost magical, hinted that her beauty was literally in enchantment."<sup>1</sup>

## VI.

Olim

Rusticus urbanum murem mus paupere fertur  
Accepisse cavo, veterum vetus hospes amicum,  
*Asper* et attentus quaesitis.

—Satires, II 6. 79.

The meaning of *asper*, illustrated by *asper victu* (Vergil, Aeneid, VIII 318) in the sense of 'faring roughly' (Wickham), may be additionally illustrated by *asper meus uictus sanest* (Plautus, Captivi, 188).

## VII.

Spectatum satis et donatum iam rude quaeris,  
Maecenas, iterum antiquo me includere ludo.

—Epistles, I 1. 2.

For *spectatum satis* compare

spectatum satis  
Putabam et magnum exemplum continentiae.

—Terence, Andria 91.

<sup>1</sup>Coleridge's Notes on Horace. See Princeton College Bulletin, Nov. 1892, p. 83.

## VIII.

Ut ventum ad cenam est, *dicenda tacenda* locutus,  
Tandem dormitum dimittitur.

—Epistles, I 7. 72.

Compare the following from the closing lines of the ninth book  
of Martianus Capella's *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*:

Loquax docta indoctis adgerans  
*Fandis tacenda* farcinat.

PRINCETON, May, 1894.

ANDREW F. WEST.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

### ON RECENT EDITIONS OF PLAUTUS.

The two new Pitt Press editions of Plautus—*Stichus*, by C. A. M. FENNELL, and *Epidicus*, by J. H. GRAY—bring the following notes in point.

*Stichus* 419-20:

Ere si ego taceam seu loquar, scio scire te  
Quam multas tecum miserias MULCAVERIM.

Dr. Fennell's note on *mulcaverim* is: "plainly corrupt," which I take to be English for Ritschl's "Emendationem exspectat verbum haud dubie corruptum." Fennell therefore proposes *mussaverim*, which is shown to make very good sense—altogether too good! Plautus tried, at any rate, to be *humorous*. We can English this by translating 'how many evils I have buffeted with you,' but the Latin has an underlying bit of *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. The element of 'gag' must also be reckoned with! Slaves and parasites were the kicked and cuffed clowns of the ancient comedy, and so they were always talking of kicking and cuffing somebody else. This began with Thersites (Homer, B 265, 231), and was ever after a stock comic feature (cf. Tyrrell's note in 'Cicero in his Letters,' Fam. IX 20. 1). I note the following examples in the *Stichus* where Gelasimus or *Stichus* talk about beating or being beaten:

- vs. 191: ei hercle verbo lumbos defractos velim;
- vs. 436: me in culpa habeto, nisi probe excruciavero <diem>;
- vs. 613: Edepol te hodie lapide percussum velim;
- vs. 751: vapulat peculium.

Accordingly, I should interpret Placidus's gloss of *mulcantem aerumnas* by *misere viventem*; *aerunna est miseria* (cited by Goetz) as harking back to this Plautus passage.

*Stichus* 425:

cadum tibi veteris vini propino.

Fennell's note is: "'I drink to your health a cask of old wine,' i. e. I wish you much happiness." Scarcely. This 'cask' makes its appearance again in vs. 647:

cadum modo hinc a me huc cum vino transferam,

and in vs. 665:

hoc <sc. vinum> mihi dono datumst.

This is followed immediately on the part of Sagarinus with the words (vs. 666)

Quis somniavit aurum?

annotated by Fennell: "Though the point is not clear, it is idle to alter." The point is perfectly clear: *Stichus* had asked his master for a holiday (vs.



421). The master not only gave the holiday, but said (vs. 425): 'I'll give you a jug of old wine to drink my health in.' For this sense cf. L. and Sc., s. v. *προπίνω* II 3, and L. and Sh., s. v. *propino* I. C. In vs. 645-6 (punctuating with a comma after *venit*) Stichus says: 'I'll put this jug that is yonder (*hinc a me*) into me (*huc*),' doubtless with a simultaneous pat of his paunch. In vs. 666 Sagarinus finds it impossible to believe that the jug is a gift and says: 'You must have been dreaming' (*Quis somniavit aurum?*<sup>1</sup>). Seyffert's fairly satisfactory emendation, *Quis homo donavit vinum*, violates the principle of *lectio difficilior* and does not follow too closely the *ductus litterarum*. Note Ter. Phorm. 67 *montes auri pollicens*.

Vs. 579:

Set ita ut occepi narrare vobis.

Here Fennell as well as the Teubner critical edition<sup>2</sup> (Goetz) print as if the beginning of the scene had fallen out, and Goetz says: "Initium scaenae intercidisse Acidalius vidit." The MSS read *sed ita quod*. Bothe seems to have suggested *sed (id quod)*. This is, I believe, the correct reading. Gelasimus had left the stage with vss. 503-4:

certumst amicos conuocare, ut consulam  
qua lege nunc med esurire oporteat.

He returns with 579-80:

set id quod occepi narrare vobis; quom hic non adfui  
cum amicis deliberaui iam et cum cognatis meis.

'But as I was telling you: in my absence I've been talking,' etc. There is no need to imagine any break before 579. In *Poenulus* 470 Antamoenides enters the stage for the first time with the words *ita ut occepi dicere* 'by the way.' At Stichus 480, *ut occepi narrare* is 'as I was saying.' If we compare *Trinummus* 897 *ita ut occepi . . . dicam*, with *Rudens* 1065 *ita ut occepi dicere*, we know that the full formula was *ita ut occepi dicere, dicam*, etc. It is obvious in the above interpretation that vs. 579 was addressed to the audience. Gelasimus does not, indeed, become aware of the presence of Pamphilippus and Epignomus till vs. 582, and the *vobis* of vs. 579 cannot refer to them, but to the audience, as in vs. 220 sq., where he auctions himself off to the audience. Entirely parallel in dramatic treatment with vss. 503-4, where Gelasimus goes to consult his relations, and vs. 579 sq., where he announces the result of his consultations, are vss. 400-1, where he goes off to rub up his best jokes from his (impromptu) commonplace-book, and vs. 449 sq., where he returns from that errand. A word needs to be said finally on my preference for the reading *sed id quod occepi* etc. The MSS read *quod*, and I note as parallels *Miles* 749 *nunc quod occepi, opsonatum pergam*; *Persa* 114 *mane quod tu occeperis negotium agere, id totum procedit diem*; and with *coepe*, *Casina* 701 *Nam quor non ego id perpetrem quod coepei* etc. Closer parallels in Cicero are brought by Brix to *Trinummus* 897, *Rosc. Amer.*, §52 *illud quod coepimus videamus* (cf. §91 *ut coepei dicere*). *Poen.* 470, however, cited above, would make for *ita ut*, but *id quod* is somewhat nearer the MSS.

<sup>1</sup> I compare for this interpretation Merc. 950 *Eho quae mi somnias, Hic homo non sanust* cf. *infra*, p. 363, n. 2).

Stichus 687-8:

nam hinc quidem  
hodie polluctura praeter nos iam dabitur nemini.

The MSS (BCDF) read *praeter nos iactura*, and Goetz regards *iactura* = *luctura* and so writes *polluctura* after *praeter nos*. Instead, I believe we are to see in *iactura* a gloss of *polluctura*. I compare Caes. B. G. 6. 12. 2 (cf. B. C. 3. 112. 10) *magnis iacturis pollicitationibusque perduxerant*, and define *iacturis* by 'bait,' deriving perhaps from the locution *semen iacere* (Varro *iactare*), or by 'boast, boastful promise'; cf. *iactare, se iactare* 'boast, make ostentatious display.' This collocation of words makes strongly for the relation I proceed to establish between *polliceor* and *polluceo*. L. and Sh. define *polluctura* for this passage by 'sumptuous feast.' The meaning clearly is 'not a *sup* <of wine> shall any one get but us.' The citations for *polluceo* show that the verb specially denoted 'vow, offer a tithe to Hercules.' This tithe would be sometimes large and sometimes small. In Stichus 233 Gelasimus begs a good price for himself at the auction: *ut, decumam partem Herculi polluceam*; and *that* tithe would surely have been a small one.<sup>1</sup> It seems to me that we must not separate *polluceo* from *polliceor* 'promise.' The variation *licet* || *lucet* was patterned on *libet* || *lubet*, and *lūceo* 'promise, boast, make boastful display' was conformed to *lūceo* 'shine.' In Rud. 1418-19:

vos quoque ad cenam vocem  
ni daturus nil sim neque sit quidquam pollucti domi,

I translate 'except I have nothing to give, and not a bite in the house.' Rud. 425:

non ego sum pollucta pago,

seems to be used in the sense of taking 'two bites of a cherry'—'I'm not a bite for the whole county,' or, more nearly in the sense of *polliceor*, 'I do not offer myself to the whole county.' At Curculio 193 *polluctus virgis servus* is 'a slave who has been promised a beating.' There remains in Plautus only *obsonate pollucibiliter* (Most. 24) where the sense of 'richly, splendidly' seems to obtain, and *pollucte prodigus*, supposed to be a fragment (ap. Fest., p. 229 Mull.). I should therefore, in the light of what has been brought forward, define *polluctura* by 'earnest' and *pollucere* by 'vow.'

Stichus 689:

nosmet inter nos ministremus MONOTROPI.

Here L. and Sh. define by 'of one kind, single,' which is objectionable as a definition of this Latin *ἀπαξ λεγ.* This compound means 'each having one turn, turn-about.' We might define by 'simple' (cf. L. and Sc., s. v. *μονότροπος* II, and Eur. Andr. 289), taking *τρόπος* in its figurative sense.

Stichus 715:

age si quid agis, accipe inquam: NON HOC INPENDET publicum.

<sup>1</sup> Was not the worship of Hercules in a moribund condition? The Potitii turned it over to the public slaves, and were themselves brought low (Liv. 1. 7. 14). This seems, perhaps, a fair inference from the Varro citation of Macrobius, III 12. 2 *maiores solitos decimam Herculi vouere nec decem dies intermittere quin pollucrent ac populum ἀσύμβολον cum corona laurea dimitterent cubitum*.

Here Ritschl has corrected the MS readings (C has *inpendit*) to *nam hoc inpendit*, which L. and Sh., s. v. *impendo* (init.), seem to interpret as 'for the public stands this expense.' The objections to this interpretation are that the MSS must be altered slightly to give it, and the wine was not at the public expense, unless very remotely as being the gift of Stichus's master. I propose, instead, to read with the MSS, interpreting as follows: 'there is no grave public question impending.' The point would then lie in the reference to Stichus's pompous military air: he had given out in vs. 702 sq. the command of the *provinces* of the feast, and Sagarinus called him (vs. 705) *stratage noster*! The point is not very acute, but the other interpretation is not better in that respect. *Inpendere* is elsewhere used twice by Plautus: Epid. 83 in te inpendent, and 135 inpendet pectori. Some importance may be given to the fact that Plautus does not use *inpendere*, unless it be kept in this passage, though he does use derivatives, e. g. *inpendio*, Aul. 18.

I turn now to the consideration of some questions, mainly of text-criticism, that attach to the Epidicus. Prof. Gray's edition is responsible for these notes, for his typography brings insistently before one's eyes the places that have been *treated* by the emenders. My own standpoint is that of a defender. I believe it cannot be too much insisted on that emendation in Plautus ought to follow the principles of emendation in prose authors, and the metre ought to be used as a corrective of emendation, not to suggest it. When the text has been thus constructed, sound metrical conclusions can be drawn. This conservative course should be specially followed in the Cantica, where the music helped to carry the metre. I take for illustration of my general drift vs. 361:

is adornat <ad>veniens domi extemplo ut maritus fias,

where the <ad> may well have fallen away by haplography, and its suiting the metre is entitled to the negative interpretation of not throwing a fair correction out of court. Very different is vs. 714, where *non illuc* of the MSS has been corrected by Müller (Pl. Pr., p. 357) to *non pol*. It were fair, perhaps, to drop *illuc* as having crept in from the verse below. So we might write the line: Abi modo intro. PER. Ei non [illuc] temerest. adserva istum, Apocides, recognizing hiatus between *intro* and *ei*. There is no justification I can imagine for inserting *pol*, except some theory of avoiding hiatus.

I pass now to a more specific consideration of individual passages, massing first those that seem to me to have been treated most amiss.

Vs. 19:

EP. mitte illa ac responde hoc (Goetz).  
ut id mi responses (Ussing<sup>1</sup>).

Here A reads UTILLAERESCOSTENTA<sup>1</sup>, B reads UT ILLI RESPON DI, and so J, with omission of DI. UT ILLA RESPONDEAS of F and the *editio princeps* (Z) is plainly an attempt to construe. I propose *ut illae res cosentant*<sup>2</sup> 'so that your facts agree,' the chaffing answer to the previous question: quid tibi vis dicam

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that *responses* is hardly a common word in Plautus, as Gray says, and the four cases cited by L. and Sh. seem to be all.

<sup>2</sup> For *cosentiant*. Cf. Brix, Trin. 41, on the doublet *evenant* | *eveniant*.

nisi quod est? The difficult form *cosentant* of the MS got its *st* perhaps from a gloss *co[n]stent*, which would have the same meaning. This is a rare word in Plautus (*consentit*, Cas. 59), but occurs in the form *cosentiant* in the epitaph of one of the Scipios.<sup>1</sup> We are in this case able to trace the genesis of the totally variant reading of B. In the phrase *ut illae res cosentant* a marginal gloss *respondeant* took the place of *cosentant*, and by haplography came *ut illae respondeat*, whence B's UT ILLI RESPON DI.<sup>2</sup>

Vss. 144, 145:

nam ni ante solem occasum e lo—  
meam domum ne inbitas. tu te in pristinum.

The attempt has been made to fill out these broken verses. Gray adopts Ussing's *e loculis prompteris* (144) and *proieceris* (145). The only Plautine passages bearing on the first point are As. 181 de pleno promitur, and Truc. 603 ex pectore promam, and the first is more nearly comparable. Plautus does not use *loculi* in the sense of 'purse.' The objections to *proieceris* are that Plautus combines with *pistrinum* (MS *pristinum*) only *tradere*, and *trahere*. Francken (Mnemos. 7. 184-209) suggests for vs. 144 *edolaveris* and for 145 *ipsus conferas*; but *edolaveris* is not Plautine and does not make good sense; *ipsus conferas* is as good as any other suggestion that has been made. I suggest that the attempt to mend these verses be given up. In *elo* (Ζ ἔλω) I believe we are to find an interjection, i. e. *eho*.<sup>3</sup> I compare Bacch. 444 provocatur paedagogus: *eho* senex minumi preti ne attigas puerum istac causa etc. Examples with *eho* at end of the line are Poen. 1128 atque *eho* Mirari noli etc. (cf. 1120), and Pseud. 1185 *eho* Mitte. That *eho* is extra-metrical (like Gr. φεῦ φεῦ, Aesch. Agam. 1307) is shown in Trin. 933:

Eho

An etiam Arabiast in Ponto.

Cf. 944. I suggest, then, the following treatment by aposiopesis, vs. 144:

unde lubet: nam ni ante solem occasum—Eho  
meam domum ne inbitas. tu te in pistrinum—

If the metre must be completed for vs. 144 one could read *ehō* <cave E'pidice> (cf. Truc. 476 *ehō* | Pithe | cium, Face ut adcumbam, and Bacch. 444, just

<sup>1</sup> See Merry's Selected Fragments, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> For *res respondeant* we have a warrant in Lucretius 4. 167 *res sibi respondent* etc.; cf. also Quint. 6. 3. 48 *quia raro verba belle respondeant*. The substitution of *respon-di* for *respondeant* is, in view of the separation, perhaps to be explained thus: the gloss was *responde illis* *COSENTA*—TH; or perhaps *RESPONDEA*— was misread *ODIA*—, and after the loss of A— the separation ensued.

<sup>3</sup> It seems not unlikely that a carelessly made *h* might be read *lo*. Gray seems to imply that the MSS read *e loc*, and then we might take *lo* as a mistake for *h* followed by an imperfect *o*. The same thing seems to have taken place in Merc. 950, where the MS reading is (B) *elo que ni somnias*, which I would correct to *eho, quae mi somnias* (*eia, quae mihi* etc., Goetz). The metre will come right by reading *ehō* (—) [or *eho tu?*] with protraction. Camerarius reads *eho quae tu*. An emendation here suggests itself for Capt. 788 Sed Ergasilus est ne hic procul quem video? <*ohe*> (Schoell). Easier would be *video eho* (sometimes written *eo*). Then the next verse would be punctuated (*Conlecto quidemst pallio*), *quidnam acturust*.

cited); but it is not easy to complete 145, whereas the explanation by aposiopesis suits the tone of the passage precisely.

Vs. 284 sq.:

EP. Tum tu igitur calide, si quid acturus age.

*Cum lenone quae opus sunt facto.* PE. Quid iam? EP. Ne te censeat.

This is Goetz's reading. Goetz has himself made the break by a transposition which involves him in fresh difficulty. In the old editions there stands after vs. 284:

285 PE. Rem, hercle, loquere, EP. et reperi, haec te qui abscedat suspitio (288)

286 PE. sine me scire. EP. Scibis, audi. AP. sapit hic pleno pectore (289)

287 EP. Opus est homine, qui illo argentum deferat pro fidicina (290)

288 Nam te illo non aequae opus facto 'st. PE. quid jam? EP. Ne te censeat (285)

289 Fili causa facere. PE. Docte. EP. Quo illum ab illa prohibeas (286)

290 Ne qua ob eam suspicionem difficultas eveniat (287).

In this version vs. 288 (285) is perfectly readable, and there is no dislocation whatever of the sense, so far as I can see. But we must now consider the MS reading of this verse. B<sup>m2</sup> reads NĀ TELONON EQUE OPUS FACTO ST, and J NAM TE LO (*sup. vers.* †ILLO) NON EQUE etc.; F: NAM TE ILLO. Out of this Goetz has got *cum lenone quae opus sunt facto*, and a poor joint with his previous line.<sup>1</sup> Far preferable is the reading of F (B<sup>2</sup>J): nam te illo non <a>eque opus facto st, with *te illo* (sc. *deferre*) repeating the *qui illo*—*deferat* of vs. 290, construed as subject of *opus est*, and repeated in a somewhat tautological *facto*.

Vs. 315:

Conducere aliquam fidicinam sibi huc domum  
Dum rem divinam faceret, cantare[t] sibi.

Goetz corrects the end of vs. 315 to *quae hodie domi*, the corruption being presumably due to a haplography in *die do*. I do not see why *sibi* should have been picked up from the next verse and have destroyed *quae*, as Goetz's reconstruction assumes. Gray follows Ussing and supplies *ut* at the end of the verse to govern *cantaret*. I propose, instead, to read *cantare* with F, a purpose infin. after *conducere* 'fetch,' an original verb of motion.<sup>2</sup> This involves reading *cantarē*. For this compare *dicerē*<sup>3</sup> (Ter. Andr. 23), *ducerē* (ib. 613?) and *ductarē* (Ep. 351), *facerē* (Capt. 894), with quantity explained below, p. 370 and note. If one wishes to justify this lengthening in a historical way, it may be done as follows: Comedy has the ablative types *retē*, *reti*, but also *retē* (cf. Gray's Introd., p. xx), whence come pairs like *ordinē* || *ordinē*, *temporē* || *temporē*,<sup>4</sup> etc., and a vigorous writer like Plautus would doubtless not have strained now and then at *ducerē* || *ducerē*, etc.

<sup>1</sup> Just the bearing of Goetz's words: "versus olim in margine suppleti sunt, unde initium truncatum repetendum," I confess I cannot see.

<sup>2</sup> The terminal acc. *domum* after *conducere* implies this interpretation.

<sup>3</sup> Explained differently by Klötz, Altröm. Metrik, 267.

<sup>4</sup> Not granted by Klötz, l. c., p. 44. At Cas. 318 *uxorē* is removed by reading *uxoren*.



Vss. 389-91:

vel quasi egomet quidum fili causa coeperam  
ego me excruciare animi quasi quid filius  
meus deliquisset med erga.

So the MSS; but

velut egomet dudum . . .  
animi med excruciare etc.

Goetz, after Fuhrmann. If we assume the original condition of the MSS to have been as follows, the genesis of the corruption can be easily traced:

389 velut egomet qui dum fili causa coeperam  
390 med excruciare animi quasi quidem filius

There was a confusion of *qui dum fili* (389) with *quidem filius* (390), whereby *quasi* moved up to a place between *egomet* and *qui dum*, and there was then a contamination of *velut* and *quasi*<sup>1</sup>; *egomet* (389) was attracted by *med* (390), and so the initial *ego me* resulted. For the combination of *quasi* and *quidem* cf. Cas. 319 *quasi venator tu quidem es*; Poen. 601 *et quidem quasi* etc. As I propose to read the verses the interpretation would be: 'myself, to wit: how I began,' etc. *Quidum* in the interrogative sense (= *quo modo*) is found at Most. 732.

Vss. 492-3:

Bellator, vale!

Euge! euge! Epidice! frugi's: pugnasti &lt;bene&gt;.

So Goetz. A reads *homo es* for *bene*. Goetz cleverly suggests that this is a gloss or supplement to *frugi's*, cf. vs. 693 *frugi's tu homo Apocides*. I do not, however, accept this. Plautus uses *frugi* fifteen times in the predicate with *esse* without any substantive—once even as a feminine: *quae frugi esse volt*, As. 175<sup>2</sup>—and if *homo* were a gloss, there was no need to repeat *es*. Instead, I would see in *pugnasti tu homo es* a corruption of *pugnasti tu <n?> homo es*. For exegesis there would then be one of two possibilities, taking *pugnasti tu homo es* with *Qui me emunxisti mucidum*, *pugnasti* being in either case abl. of means—1st in the physical sense: this unpleasant action is affirmed to have been performed for Periphanes with the fist<sup>3</sup>; or 2d, *pugnasti* is to be taken in the sense of 'whopper.' We know that in the Comedy of Manners the battles were all sham; and the use of *pugnasti* of the exertions of Epidicus would have been suggested by *bellator* in the previous verse. As to the first interpretation, Plautus plays frequently on the physical sense of *emungere*, e. g. Cas. 391 *At tu ut oculos emungere ex capite per nasum tuos*; Most. 1108 sq.:

TH. Prope med emunxisti. VR. Vide sis, satine recte: num mucii fluunt.

TH. Immo etiam cerebrum quoque omne mi e capite emunxisti meo.

<sup>1</sup> I note at Asin. 838 the collocation *ut quasi—si*.

<sup>2</sup> The instances are As. 498; Aul. 719; Bacch. 370, 665; Capt. 269; Cas. 562; Mil. 1360; Most. 133; Pers. 454 (cf. 841); Poen. 721, 963, 1098; Trin. 441, 1182.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps this violence may have been suggested by the idiom *pactere pugnasti* (Men. 1017). It is easy to account for the separation of *pugnasti* from its verb by imagining a drastic gesture. Cf. Curc. 726 *hisce* (sc. *pugnasti*) *ego si tu me inritaveris, Placidum te hodie reddam*.

In favor of the latter interpretation, which I myself prefer, I cite Truc. 486 Qui . . . condemnati falsis de pugnis sient. *Pugna* was Latin for 'fish-story.'

Vs. 567:

Fac videam, si mea, si salva mea sit.

So Goetz. B reads *simevisSEN*. I propose to read: fac videam si me vis \*VISSE NUM (m)ea sit. PER. Eho istinc Canthara. In this reading \*visse is a short form of *vidisse*, warranted in general by such forms as \*traxe (Trin. 743, with Brix's note); *ausim* is a similar (aorist) form to a stem in -d. *ea sit* has been lost in B by a haplography with *eo* (eho) *istinc*, but J preserves *sit* followed by *ne*, replacing perhaps the lost *num*.<sup>1</sup>

I call attention here to the construction of *vis* with the perf. infin., though so far as the form is concerned, *vis-se* is like *da-re es-se*. With the pass. infin. the ellipsis of the verb *esse* is the rule (Gildersleeve-Lodge, 280 c). The Roman point of view can be seen from Quint. 9. 3. 9 *utimur et verbo pro participio*: 'magnum dat ferre talentum,' tamquam 'ferendum,' et participio pro verbo: 'volo datum.' This standing ellipsis goes back to the prehistoric origin of the construction: *datum* is in Quintilian's example an infinitive, the Lat. supine (after verbs of motion). The genesis of the inflected infinitive, for it amounts to this, is the same as of the gerundive from the dat. infin. in -dae (cf. my art. in Am. J. Phil. XV, p. 221<sup>2</sup>). I illustrate by the following examples (from L. and Sh.): Curc. 335 PH. *Perdis me tuis dictis*. CU. *Immo servo et servatum volo* 'Nay, I'm saving you, and to save (you) is what I want.' This the Romans had interpreted as a participle, so we have Cist. 4. 2. 39 *sunt qui volunt te conventam*; As. 120 *si quid recte curatum velis*; Capt. 53 *vos quod monitos voluerim*: full inflection for gender and number. From this inflection the form received the interpretation of a perf. infin. pass., whence the perf. tense in the act. came also to be employed with *volo* in the sense of a present (cf. L. and Sh., s. v. *volo* I A. 3).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For *num* with an indirect question in Plautus see Persa 78.

<sup>2</sup> It is noteworthy how uniformly Latin has developed its infinitives into participles. Thus, from *aptus rei publicae gerendae* the steps were *aptus ad rem publicam gerendam*, whence *aptus ad regnum regendum*, and so finally *aptus regnando* in place of an original *aptus regnandae* (cf. the author, Am. J. Phil. XV, p. 222, note). So Postgate has shown (Cl. Rev. V 301) that *daturum* is for *datu esum* 'to be about to give,' *esum* being infin. and *datu* 'supine'; from *eum daturum* there was an extension to *eam daturam* and *eos daturus*. The illustrations in the text show that the infinitive in *otum* ('supine') came also to be interpreted as a ptc.

<sup>3</sup> I cannot agree with the theory of Howard, in the Harvard Studies, II, p. 119, that *fecisse volo* is a fut. pf. In the first place, we should expect *facere volui*; in the second place, the omission of *esse* with the passive forms is the rule of the language, and this is the only common use, for the active is rare. The employment of the active is practically limited to the official edict style (L. and Sh., s. v. *volo* I A. 3). An explanation presents itself from the consideration of the archaic nature of the idiom: at some Italic period before the rhotacistic change was completed, there must have been doublets like \**amase* || *amare* in popular use. Verrius Flaccus and the archaist Festus preserved, as we know, pre-rhotacistic forms. In regard of a phrase like *neve coniurase velet* (Sen. Cons. de Bacch.), who shall say that *coniurase* is not ultimately an archaic *coniurare* interpreted as a perf. infin. because of *fuisse*, modelled on *esse* according to what seems the most probable explanation (cf. V. Henry, Gr. Comp., §161)? By this assumption the spread of the *fuisse* type to other verbs is made easy. That the forms in the Sen. Cons. de Bacch. represent fut. pfs. I cannot agree. They are simple futs. Thus in *ita exdeicendum censuere: nei quis eorum sacanal* (l. e. *bac<sup>o</sup>*) *habuisse velet*. *Sei quos esent, quei sibi deicerent necesus esse bacanal habere eis*

Vs. 627. Here the MSS read: DI INMORTALES SOCIO IUSSI ADMIRER (J), SCIO IUSSI etc. (BF), OCIO IUSSI etc. (B<sup>3</sup>). This was corrected by Brix to *sicin iussi ad me ire*. Goetz reads *otiose adbitis* (!). For the rest of the line the MSS read *pedibus pulmu(o), JF*nes. Gray adopts a 'clever' conjecture of Palmer's: si Iovis iussu ad me iret pedibus, plumipes Qui perhibetur, prius venisset, quam tu advenisti mihi, who explains *plumipes qui perhibetur* as equal to *Mercurius*. We should then have to assume that the angry lover was ironical,<sup>1</sup> for Mercury was storm-swift (cf. Vg. Aen. IV 241 rapido pariter cum flamine). Very far from a cogent parallel is Catull. 55. 27 Adde huc plumipedes volatilesque, where no reference to Mercury can be fixed, and the use of the plural speaks against it. Prof. Palmer has, I suppose, brought to his support Stich. 274 Mercurius, Iovis qui nuntius perhibetur, but I do not see how that makes for his position, particularly as *plumipes* is a very uncommon word (cited by L. and Sh. only for Cat. 55. 28). Here too we must stick by the MSS, in my opinion, and not correct, as Goetz does, following Brix, to *pedibus plumbeis*. Assuming either the conjectures of Goetz or Palmer as the original, then the scribes changed in every way to a *lectio difficilior*. I suggest, instead, the following:

di inmortales | <te> otio | iussi ad | mirer<e> | <sup>2</sup>: pedibus pulmonis  
qui perhibetur prius venisset etc.

In vs. 623 Stratippocles had said to his servant: *adspecta et contempla <mulierem>*. "Upon my soul," he now says, "I have bidden you (Epicurus) admire her at your leisure."<sup>3</sup> The snail-footed man in the story

utei ad pr. urbanum *venirent*, '*habuisse*' *volet* is no more a fut. pf. than '*venirent*'; again, in neve extrad urbem sacra quisquam *fecisse volet*, nisei pr. urbanum *adiisset*, '*fecisse volet*' plays the rôle of a fut. to the fut. pf. in '*adiisset*'. That this archaism was a bit of legal terminology is clear enough from a passage in Gellius, X 3. 3 uxor eius *dixit* se in balneis virilibus *lavari velle* . . . *edixerunt* ne quis in balneis *lavasse vellet*, where '*lavasse vellet*' is as little fut. pf. as '*lavari velle*'. It is possible that the past tense *lavasse* has been attracted by the past tense *vellet* both here and in the Sen. Cons. de Bacch. We can see such an attraction in Liv. 24. 16. 11 priusquam omnes iure libertatis *aequassem*, neminem nota strenui aut ignavi militis *notasse volui*. Here we can translate 'I should have wished to have no one branded' (= *notatum habere*). Besides the passages to be attributed to the archaic edict style (Liv. 29. 14. 8; 29. 17. 3; 38. 11. 9; Ter. Hec. 563; Cato de Agr. V 4; Varro ap. Non., p. 394), Howard cites but few others until after Livy. In Livy 42. 11. 1 quibus credidisse malis 'such as one would be glad to believe,' I find a clean use of the tenses = *si credideris gaudebis*. So also Hor. A. P. 347 (cf. in this sense Riemann, Synt. Lat., §154, rem. VI). At Liv. 32. 21. 32 *quia pepercisse vobis volunt* is a periphrasis for the pass. form *quia vos servatos volunt*, due to the intransitive nature of *parcere* and its lack of a ptc. Howard cites four passages from comedy (Ter. Ad. 519; Pl. Poen. 570; 1206; Rud. 662) for *velim* + pf. subj. as a 'periphrasis for the fut. pf.' Poen. 1206 is instructive: Nimiae voluptati st . . . Quod haruspex de ambabus *dixit* . . . *velim* de me aliquid *dixerit*. *Dixerit* unquestionably repeats *dixit*. Here we are on the border-line of the unreal and ideal. The wish is in the past; the wisher does not know the result: 'I hope he has said something about me.' This principle of explanation applies to the other passages which shade into the unreal more or less.

<sup>1</sup> My impression is that such irony as this would be is not a feature of Plautus's style.

<sup>2</sup> The indicated scansion is undeniably heavy; perhaps we should read *ad me ire*, with Brix, *te* thus referring to the Danista. The actor possibly beat time with his foot, to prepare the audience for the rise and fall implied in *pedibus pulmonis*.

<sup>3</sup> For this use of *otio* for *cum otio*, I cannot cite another passage in Plautus, but he uses *salute* for *cum salute* (cf. Brix on Men. 134). Comparable are the adverbs of manner *iure*, *ratione*, *silentio*, and Phaedrus, I 24. 6 uses *otio*.

would have come sooner than you (the Danista)." The *pulmo marinus* (Gr. *πλεύμων*) seems to have been to Pliny (N. H. 9. 47. 71) something of the jelly-fish sort.<sup>1</sup> Now, a jelly-fish rises and falls with the wave, but his motion toward an object is illusory, like a hobby-horse's. A jelly-fish pace is a sort of superlative to a snail's pace.<sup>2</sup> According to my proposed reading, <te> was thus lost: TEOTIO, next TIOTIO, by dictation (?) CIOCIO. This was simplified by the loss of the no longer intelligible CI° in the class of MSS represented by J's reading s-ocio; by the haplographic loss of CIO° in the class represented by B's s-cio, s- in both cases being taken up from °TĀLES to make a sensible word. In *admirer* for *admirere* we are perhaps to see *admire* by haplography, and then *adm-ir-er* by dittography. Note, however, below (p. 372) *vider* for the infin. *videre*. The corruption of *i* to *e* in *pulmones* may be palaeographic, or may have been a correction on the part of some archetypal scribe. For the construction *jubere aliquem* c. subj. cf. Stich. 396 *jube famulos rem divinam me* apparent.

Vs. 632. Gray (Ussing) reads: Tene cruminam: huc inde: <capit> ST. <An tu nevis> etc. Goetz: Tene c.: h. i.: ST. Sapienter <mones> etc. Barring differences in the cast, the MSS agree substantially, and read SAPIENTER VENIS. The reading is right, I believe. Stratippocles says: 'you are wise to make terms' (i. e. not to haggle about terms); cf. Cic. Ver. 2. 3. 146 *ad tuam veniam condicionem* 'I accept your terms.'<sup>3</sup>

I now pass to other corrections, in the main of smaller import.

Vs. 7: Quod eo adsolet (MSS). Gray (Ussing) *ad* <di> *solet*, Goetz (Acidalius) *coadsolet*. The language of comedy is highly elliptical, pace Ussing; *coadsolet* is not a quotable Latin word, pace Goetz. Cf. Pers. 759 *Ponite hic quae adsolent* <sc. *hic poni*> (cf. Ter. Andr. 481), and the common Latin phrase *ut adsolet*. *Eo* is a terminal case with the ellipsed verb of the previous question, *Quid ceterum* <verbum addis>; cf. Rud. 1007.

Vs. 35: *Sed quid | ais* <tu>. Read: *Sed quid | ā(j)is* |, with the MSS. Cf. *cōnīcīt* (Mil. 112), i. e. *conjicit* (?) in popular pronunciation. Note also 1st pers. *āio*, i. e. *ājo*. Is it not better to recognize *āis* than to insert *tu*?

Vs. 50. MSS:

EP. Vae misero mihi: male perdidit me. TH. quid istuc quidnam est.

Goetz corrects to *quid ais tu*. TH. *Quid est*. I suggest to read as the MSS, but *nam quid est*. Cf. Ep., vs. 58 *Nam quid ita?* with Gray's note.

Vs. 55:

Et is danista advenit una cum eo qui argentum petit.

<sup>1</sup> L. and Sh., s. v. *pulmo*, read for our passage *pulmon es* 'you are a fool.' This leaves *qui perhibetur* as surplusage, and is based on a misinterpretation of the passage cited from Pliny, who says that these animals are like vegetables, and have no senses.

<sup>2</sup> We must remember that Plautus was long before Pliny. Possibly *pulmo* in the *sermo popularis* was an occasional name for slugs, or snails, to which modern zoology has given the class name *pulmonata*. Why? Plato, Philebus 21 C, associates the *πλεύμων* with the oyster.

<sup>3</sup> I can furnish no example of this ellipsis, but Men. 1160 suggests that the relation of *veneo*: *venio* may have been enough to justify it. *Venibit uxor quoque etiam, si quis emptor venerit*, where *venerit* might be taken in much the same way as I have taken *venis* above, but I do not insist (cf. Asin. 154).

Gray reads *atque* for *qui*, or else would read *petat*. Goetz reads with the MSS, and so would we, taking *qui* as the simple relative referring to *is danista*.

Vs. 136:

Hercle <qui> miserumst ingratum esse homini id quod facias bene.

So Goetz. Omit *qui* and read with hiatus *in pausa* after *esse*.

Vs. 204. Epidicus comes gasping up with *mane! sine respirem*. Brix suggests *mane* <*dum*>, and Gray *mane* <*sis*>. May we not imagine that Epidicus filled up the lacking short with a gasp instead?

Vs. 251 sq.:

Quia hodie adlatæ tabellæ sunt ad eam a Stratippocle:  
<eum> argentum sumpsisse apud Thebas ab danista fenore:  
id paratum <esse> et se ob eam rem id ferre.

By this emendation vs. 252 is O. O. reporting the chitchat of the Meretrix, and vs. 253 O. O. reporting the contents of the letter. It were simpler to read vs. 251 argen | tum sum | psisse apud | Thebas | <se> ab da | nista | fenor | e.

Vs. 254. MS:

haec sic aiebat sic audivisse (B<sup>1</sup> *audivi sese*) se abse atque epistola.

Goetz: . . . audivisse ex eapse atque epistola. Gray (Ussing): se audivisse ex eapse <*adlata*> epistula. I propose sic audivisse se abs eat (i. e. -*d*) epistola. The difficulties in this reading are that *abs* before vowels seems not known in Plautus. Neue Formenlehre, II<sup>3</sup>, p. 830, explains away inscription instances, e. g. "Unrichtig ist auch *abs iis* für *ab iis*, Corp. Inscr. Lat. Col. I. Z 5." Now, *abs* is not a historical form of the preposition, but one developed on Latin ground by abstraction from verbs, e. g. *ab-stulit*, interpreted as *abs-tulit*.<sup>2</sup> But the Romans used side by side *abs te* and *a te*, Cicero using first *abs te*, later *a te*. The preference for *abs te* in the *sermo popularis* of Plautus's comedies doubtless arose from the confusion of *ad te* and *ā te* in rapid utterance. The form *ab-s* was helped into being with nouns by *ex*,<sup>3</sup> but, save in the phrase *abs te* (*tuo tuis* etc.), Plautus seems to use it only with *terra* (Trin. 947), *chorago* (Pers. 159, but *ā chorago* Trin. 858); he further has *abs qua* (Menaech. 345) and in Terence *abs quivis* is found (Ad. 254). From *abs qua* to *abs ea* is not a long step. If the archetype had *absead* when this was divided *ab se ad(t)*, the passage of *at* into *atque* was most easy.

Vs. 283: *Vive sapis, Et placet* (B). Goetz: *sane sapit*. Gray (Ussing): *tu ne sapis*. I suggest *vi nē sapis* = 'You are, I trow, mighty wise.' Plautus has *amoris vi* (Merc. 58) and *vi Veneris victus* (Trin. 657). We can thence infer *vis sapientiae* and *vi sapis*. Note also vs. 289 *sapit pleno pectore*.

Vs. 341:

Pro di immortales mi hunc diem <ut> dedistis luculentum.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Brix, Trin.<sup>4</sup>, p. 15, and Fowler[-Brix], Men., p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the author in Am. J. Phil. XIII, p. 466, and note in addition that *su-stulit* is of precisely the same reduplicative type, so far as the consonants go, as *si-sto*.

<sup>3</sup> This is sufficient alone to the creation of the form.



*Ut* is inserted by Guyet. Not necessary; *hunc* is predicative = a splendid day is this you have given me.

Vs. 351:

peratum (B, *par*<sup>o</sup> J) ductare, at ego follitim ductitabo.

The correction of Camerarius to *peratim* seems every way right. Read *ductarē*, at with hiatus in *pausa* (cf. supra, p. 364).

Vs. 411 sq.:

ut ille fidicinam

<Facete> fecit nescire esse emptam tibi:

Ita ridibundam etc.

*Facete* is Goetz's emendation. In view, however, of the fact that J reads *Illam ridibundam*, I suggest that the original state of the MSS was *illam fecit nescire esse emptam tibi*, with hiatus in *pausa* after *nescire*. For *ille*—*illam* cf. Ep. 250 Ibi illa interrogavit illam etc.

Vs. 438: *virtute belli armatus promerui* etc. Gray, following Ribbeck, reads *animatus*. Geppert *ornatus*. Goetz has for once retained the MS reading. Why change it?

Vs. 712: PER. *Tu meruisti?* EP. *Visse intro*. B and Goetz; but J reads *iusse*. I suggest that we should read EP. I, *visse intro*; cf. Bacch. 901,<sup>1</sup> I, *visse*.

I now turn to certain corrections that have been made for purely metrical considerations, though the last group was not entirely exclusive of such.

Vss. 46-7:

Nam certo priusquam hinc ad legiōnem abiit domo,  
Ipse mandavit mihi ab lenone ut fidicinā etc.

Goetz in his edition inserts after *hinc* <in Thebas>, and (following Ribbeck) <interim> after *mihi*. The MSS make very good *senarii* read as I have accented the verses. Vs. 45 is a trochaic *septenarius*. The excited questions of vs. 45 suit well with that metre; vss. 46-7 are plain narrative. These three verses are thrown in near the end of a group of iambic *octonarii*. Why not? Cf. Capt. 200-2, three *senarii* in a group of iambic *octonarii*, and Amph. 1068, a trochaic *septenarius* preceded and followed by iambic *octonarii*; Capt.

<sup>1</sup>I ask whether *visse* is used anywhere, with a terminal phrase, without an *i* in the context. At Capt. 894 B<sup>1</sup> seems to read *vos e* and E reads *vis erat*, B<sup>2</sup> reads *visse ad portum* etc. We might read *i visse* | *ad por* | *tum* HFG. *Facer* | *i cer* | *tumst*: *tu intus* | *cura* etc. (For *facere* cf. supra, p. 364.) Or we may read *visse, i ad portum* etc.; cf. Miles 301 *Visse, abi intro*, and perhaps *visse ad me intro*, Mil. 520, should be *me* <*i*> *intro*; cf. Truc. 197 *i intro, amabo, Visse illam*. At Rudens 567 A reads ESTVTESE where there is some doubt of the dotted letters. B, C, D read *est visse*, and Bothe's reconstruction of *es*: *i, visse* seems almost certain, especially as the VTES of A might be VEIS. There remains only Most. 793. A reads QUIDNUMVIS VISASPECTA Tuo etc. B<sup>2</sup>CD *Quid nunc? Visse specta tuo*, but B<sup>1</sup> *Vis expectatuo*. I suggest that we read *Quid num vis Tr. I specta tuo* etc. Or perhaps *Quidnam*. *Quid num* is perhaps for *Num quid* (cf. Gray's note on *nam quid*=*quid nam*, Ep. 58). The dittography *visvis* of unruled MSS like A is of easy explanation. In B<sup>2</sup>CD there is a wrong division and the common palaeographic confusion of E and I; in the ASPECTA of A we are to see a variant of E-SP<sup>o</sup>, a correction due to the pair *ascendere* | *escend*<sup>o</sup> perhaps, or in prototypes of A there were the variants ISP<sup>o</sup> and IASP<sup>o</sup>. Note in the next verse *age i duce me*.

525 is a *senarius* preceded by nine iambic *octonarii* and followed by seven trochaic *septenarii*.<sup>1</sup>

Vs. 306:

Nullum ésse opínor egó agrum ín <omni> agro<d> At'tico.

Read *egó* with hiatus *in pausa*, and omit <omni>.

Vs. 325:

Nullam tibi esse in illo copiam ST. Interii hercle ego <oppido>.

So Goetz, completing the trochaic *septenarius*. I propose, if we must complete the vs., *equidem* after *hercle* (cf. Men. 504), reading *cópidm*, with hiatus and *syllaba anceps in pausa* (cf. Brix, Trin.<sup>4</sup>, p. 21). The loss of *equidem* may have been due to tachygraphy of *quidem*. The loss of *equidem* after *ego* seems more probable than the loss of *oppido*.

Vs. 333:

Vae tibi <iners> muricide homo! CH. Qui tibi lubet mihi male loqui.

Read without *iners*, as a trochaic *septenarius*. See just above, vss. 46-7, for examples of such treatment. One would expect an interjection like *vae* to be accented.<sup>2</sup>

Vss. 333-6 may be read, however, as trochaic *septenarii* thus:

Vae tibi | muri | cide ho | mo || qui | tibi lu | bet mihi | male lo | qui.  
 Quippe tu | me aliquid | aliquo | modo || ali | cunde ab | aliqui | bus bla | tis.  
 Quod nus | quam <nun | quam>st<sup>3</sup> neque | ego <qu>id<em> | inmit | to  
 in<du><sup>4</sup> au | res me | as  
 Nec mihi | plus ad | iumen | ti das | quam ille qui | numquam eti | am na | tust.

I now pass to the examination of omissions, sometimes due to confusion of vocatives of the characters with the rubric of the MSS, a category again not exclusive.

<sup>1</sup> So Fleckeisen; Brix differs, but not materially.

<sup>2</sup> This accords with Plautine usage. *Vae* is initial in line and accented 13 times, initial in sentence and accented 25 times. It elides only twice, and then in the phrase *vae aetati tuae* (Capt. 885, Stich. 594). In Pseud. 1317 *Vae victis* in a lyric measure should possibly be differently accented, and C leaves a space after (?) *ae*. Rudens 375 reads *Vae capiti atque aetati tuae*, but B has a space of five letters after *vae*, a possible sign of corruption in the text. The text goes on, *Tuo mea Ampelisca*. Possibly *vae* represents a Gr.  $\phi\epsilon\upsilon$  in the original, and made a line by itself (cf. *eho* supra, p. 363), followed by <Tuo> *capiti* etc. In Poen. 783 *vae vóstrae aetati*. *Id quidem* <nunc in> *mundos tuae*, the text is corrupt, or at least does not scan according to received principles. If we read *vae* (<sup>u</sup>) *vostrae aetati*. *Id quidem mundo* <d> *est tuae*, we should have another instance of quasi-extra-metrical interjection. At Miles 1078 *Et pueri án | nos oc | tin gén | tos ví | vont*. *Vae* | tibi | nugá | tor, I treat the first foot as a cretic (for at least Cretic words occur in the first foot, cf. Klotz, l. c., p. 62, and the reading *pver* for *puer* is like *quattvor*, Brix, Trinummus<sup>4</sup>, p. 21), and thus *vae* falls under the accent.

<sup>3</sup> W. W. in Lit. Centr.-Blatt, 1879, No. 11.

<sup>4</sup> For *indu* | *endo* see Neue Formenlehre, II<sup>3</sup>, pp. 907-8. This archaism survives in Ennius, Lucilius, Lucretius. *Indu* was doubtless dead in the *sermo popularis*, but Plautus may have allowed himself to use it in combination with *aures*, because of *indauidisse* (Merc. 944). Cf. Brix to Miles, vs. 213, who cites eight instances of this verb, and note *indipiscor* (Brix, Trin.<sup>4</sup>, 224).

Vs. 62. Above this vs. Goetz prints an omission. The MSS read

ita voltum tuom (61)

Videor vider<sup>1</sup> conmeruisse hic me absente in te aliquid mali (62).

Gray reads *ut voltum tuom* | *Video, videre*. Goetz reads *videor videre* etc., after an 'out.' In vss. 59-60: plus scire satiust quam loqui | Servom hominem: ea sapientias, Epidicus has been showing an unwonted prudence. Thesprio replies in 61: . . . trepidas Epidice. He then asks, after noticing some scar (?) on Epidicus: ita <n> voltum tuom Videor vider <e> conmeruisse etc.; here *voltum* is subject of *conmeruisse*: 'do I seem to see that your face has brought some trouble on you?'—a rather humorous way to put it. In restoring ita <n> the assumption of a falling out of N in the group ANV is not hard, or perhaps we should assume  $\Delta \sim V$ .

Vs. 116:

Si hercle haberem <pollicerer>. STR. Nam quid te igitur rettulit  
Beneficum esse oratione, si ad rem auxilium emortuomst.

Goetz, who adopts Müller's emendation of *pollicerer*, a very good one, as emendations go (cf. e. g. vs. 331, where the same speaker says: Si hercle habeam, pollicerer lubens), tells us: "In B STRATIPPOCES post *haberem* scriptum est a rubricatore, quod lacunae esse signum videtur." Why not read the name Stratippocles in the text with aposiopesis, thus: CH. Si hercle haberem Stratippocles—, followed by STR.<sup>2</sup> Nam quid etc.

Vs. 186: Sed ecum! ipsum! ante aedis conspicio <erum meum atque> Apocide <m>. Acidalius is responsible for the addition. Instead I would supply *cum* after *conspicio*, lost (as *com*?) by haplography with °cor; and I would also read *anti* <d>,<sup>3</sup> and to recognize a startled whispering enunciation allowing hiatus in *pausa* with *ecum! ipsum!* Thus: sed éc | cum íp | sum án | tid aé | dis cón | spicór | cum Apóe | cide. By the loss of *cum*, *Apocide* was taken for a rubric, and a space allowed (still represented in B, cf. infra, vs. 206) for the supposed speech. Instead, *qualis volo vetulos duo* (vs. 187) should be recognized as an iambic *dimeter*,<sup>4</sup> not a fragment of an *octonarius*.

Vs. 190. Before this vs. Goetz indicates two 'outs'—one for R. Müller and one for himself. It is well known that stage versions differ from authors' versions, and one dare not be dogmatic in regard of 'outs,' but everything necessary for sense and syntax is 'in' here. In sc. 1 the two old men have been discussing a second marriage for Periphanes. At sc. 2 Epidicus comes up and sees them, and addresses the audience; the old men continue to talk, but not necessarily to the audience. Periphanes had said at vs. 173 *Revereor filium*, and the last word of their talk in sc. 1 was *maritast* (vs. 180). When

<sup>1</sup>In Merc. 282 the MSS *dicere numquid* has been interpreted by Sonnenschein (Trans. Am. Ph. Ass. 1893, p. 14) as *dicere*. Thus *vider* | *videre* (the latter an impv. form in Latin) is comparable to *duc* | *duce*. Why not read our verse thus:

videór | vidér' | commérv | isse híc | med ábs | ente ín | te aliquid | malí.

<sup>2</sup>Or possibly Ep. in an *aside* (?).

<sup>3</sup>*Antid* was alive to Plautus in *antidea*, *antidhac* and in the compound *antidire* (8 times in Plautus; cf. Brix, Trin., vs. 546). That *anti* <d> grew out of *pród* seems clear, just as *poste* | *post* is an affection from *ante*.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Gleditsch in Iw. Müller's Handbuch, II<sup>2</sup>, p. 829.

they can be heard again after Epidicus's speech, Apocides says: *Continuo ut maritus fiat*. We can hardly imagine, however, that the talk of the old men began to be heard here where *ut* has no regimen. B has a space (*personae spatium*, Goetz) before *continuo*. We shall see presently (vs. 206) that if words get out of their place in the line in B, a blank is left for them, and an archetype may well have made some confusion with its short iambic dimeter (vs. 189). Into this *personae spatium* I propose to put <Fác> con | tino ut ma | ritus | fiat.

Vs. 206:

APOCIDES. SCIT FACTUM

EP. (space of 14 letters) EGO ITA FACTUM ESSE DICO.

Such is the state of things in B. In J we have *sic factum*, and in F *sic factum est*. I suggest that vs. 206 originally ended with *Quid est?*; thus there was liability to confusion with the rubric. The rubricator in B wrote names within the lines with black ink, and the rubric takes a variety of abbreviations (cf. Goetz, Praef., p. xiii). Who shall say that APOEQUIDEST did not give rise to the APOCIDES of B? I suggest AP. <Quid est? | (207) Quis> scit factum? Note that B having misplaced <Quis> *scit factum*, left a space in the next verse (cf. supra, vss. 186, 190).

Vs. 267: EP. *Continuo arbitretur uxor tuo gnato etc.* Before this vs. Goetz puts an 'out': "videntur quaedam intercdisse quae ad verborum contextum vix abesse possunt." *Continuo* is most frequently apodotic in Plautus (but cf. Epid., vs. 360 *continuo hic ero*); even here the apodotic force may be intended to be conveyed, and from *continuo* we may infer a protactic 'Well, if I must speak,' an idea conveyed easily by a gesture, or the tone of the voice, and not requiring the assumption of an 'out.'

Vss. 444-7. These four verses have been transferred by Goetz from their place in the MSS, 431-4. Acidalius had put them after vs. 455. I believe we should adhere to the MSS. I construe *stultitias* (vs. 444) on the analogy of *longum est*. In vs. 430 Periphanes says: 'my son would have had the laugh on me <by getting the girl>.' He goes on: 'I should have been a fool to blame him for it, for I was up to that sort of thing myself when I was a soldier'; then he adds, with an irrelevance not unlike Plautus: *pugnis memorandis meis Eradicabam hominum aureis*. Precisely the same line of reflection turns up at vs. 390 sq. The words *pugnis memorandis* etc. are so pat where Goetz puts them that I cannot imagine that a scribe could have intentionally changed them, and there seems no occasion for change by *homoioteleuton*. In their MS place they serve as a deft transition to vss. 431-2, where Periphanes turns and sees the swaggering soldier. Repellant is *illi* (vs. 444) after *tuas* (vs. 441), to Goetz's arrangement of the lines.

Vs. 578. Here an 'out' seems to be justified by A, for two lines' space is left; so Goetz reads, vs. 577 sq.:

Scio quid erres: quia vestitum atque ornatum immutabilem  
habet haec . . .

. . . PH. aliter catuli longe olent aliter suis.

B leaves a space of 2-3 letters after *catuli*. If the MSS before A had a

rubric, the confusion may have arisen in this way, reading: *hábet haec mûlier*. MULIER: *áliter cátuli <aliís> olént, alitér suis* = 'the young smell differently to different people, and still differently to their mothers (*suis*),' i. e. 'the mother knows.' For *catuli* = 'children' cf. *haec canes* (Trin. 172, Poen. 1236) = *hic homo, ego*. If in a rubricated MS the first *mulier* fell out by haplography, and the chain of succession to A passed through a non-rubricated MS,<sup>2</sup> the gap (cf. *supra*, vs. 206, for B's treatment) may have come to be the full line in A, whereas B, etc., may represent the real state of things better, as in Stichus, vs. 511 (cf. Fennell, p. xix).

I note now a place where Gray seems to me to have gone wrong in his individual comment. In vs. 35 Stratippocles had lost his arms. Epidicus cries 'Dreadful.' Thesprio replies: 'It's happened before; it will be an honor to him, as it has been to others before.' In this Gray sees a political allusion. Instead, the element of literary parody is specially strong in the Epidicus. Stratippocles' arms have just been likened to those Thetis brought to Achilles. In vs. 490 an allusion has been made to Iphigeneia at Aulis; here, just after the Homeric touch I would see a reference to Archilochus and his elegiac poem on his abandoned shield.<sup>3</sup>

I observe that the foregoing notes on Plautus proceed from the extreme, conservative standpoint that the MSS are a better guide than metrical theories, and as between a violation of metrical norms and text correction that would be improbable in a prose author, I have preferred the latter alternative. I have doubtless gone too far myself in this direction.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY,<sup>4</sup>  
LEXINGTON, VA.

EDWIN W. FAY.

An Avesta Grammar in Comparison with Sanskrit. By A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON. Part I. Phonology, Inflection, Word-Formation, with an Introduction on the Avesta. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1892.

Avesta Reader. First Series, Easier Texts, Notes and Vocabulary. By A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1893.

Science is of the world, and its followers know no national boundaries. The best product is sought, of whatever origin. Yet to us who so often look beyond the Atlantic for the best thing on a given subject, it cannot but be gratifying when we can say "in this case the work acknowledged to be the best is written in English and by an American." We have long had this undisputed satisfaction in the case of the Sanskrit Grammar, the loss of the author of which is so universally mourned. While not claiming that Jackson's Avesta Grammar is a great work in the sense in which this is true of Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar, we may be confident that it is destined to take its place as

<sup>1</sup> So B rubricates Philippa.

<sup>2</sup> A is itself spaced, but not rubricated.

<sup>3</sup> No. 5 in Pomtow's *Lyrici Graeci* = Bergk 6.

<sup>4</sup> My colleagues in America will understand the impossibility of my commanding the periodical literature without larger library facilities than I now enjoy. I am under obligations for references to periodicals to Professor Warren, of Johns Hopkins, who is at once *et magister et amicus*.



the best Avestan grammar in existence. The book meets an actual necessity. In the first place, there never has been a good practical grammar of the Avestan language. Spiegel is too discursive, Geiger too meagre, Bartholomae too condensed. But aside from this, a new treatment of the subject was required by the new edition of the texts.<sup>1</sup> And Jackson, himself a pupil and friend of Geldner's, was in a particularly favorable position to undertake this work. Not only could he learn from him the readings of those portions of the text still unpublished, but also take advantage of the improvements which Geldner has made on his own text since publication; and how numerous these changes are can be realized only by one who has had a look at Geldner's private copy.

The grammar opens with an introduction on the Avesta, reprinted from the author's article in the *International Cyclopaedia*. Concise information is given upon the history of the world's acquaintance with the Avesta, upon its contents and religion, the manuscripts and the Pahlavi version. An excellent grammatical summary of the language of the Avesta concludes the introduction. The author's attitude toward the great fundamental questions—such as the age of the Avesta, personality of Zoroaster, development of the religion—is the same as that maintained by Geldner in his articles in the *Cyclopaedia Britannica* and also, independently, by Bartholomae. The reviewer feels strongly that this attitude is the only correct one, and rejoices that the radically different views of Darmesteter, as advanced in the introduction to his English translation, and which not long since reached such a startling culmination in the introduction to his French translation, have found no place in Jackson's work.

The introduction is followed by specimens of text with transliteration, a table of the alphabet with the author's transliteration compared with that of Justi, and a list of books most necessary for the beginner. Jackson's system of transliteration is that which he had already proposed and explained in detail in his pamphlet, *The Avesta Alphabet and its Transcription*. This system is in several respects superior to all its predecessors, and it is earnestly hoped that it will be adopted even by those who for one or the other character might prefer another sign; for nowhere has the want of unity in transliteration been such a bane as in Avestan philology. Hübschmann's transcription bids fair to remain in favor among those who busy themselves with Iranian dialectology, cf. Horn in *Indog. Anzeiger*, I, p. 102. But there seems to be no good reason why Jackson's transcription could not be adapted, with necessary additions, to the needs of Iranists. The chief obstacle is the fact that numerous works of this class have already made use of Hübschmann's system. This is used in Horn's *Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie*, and is also, as it seems, likely to be adopted in the projected *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*.

In the body of the grammar, the Phonology gives an account of the Avestan sounds in comparison with those of Sanskrit, a knowledge of which is rightly presupposed. If it frequently fails to meet the strict demands of a compar-

<sup>1</sup> The *Avesta Grammar* of Kavasji Edalji Kanga (Bombay, 1891) does indeed reckon with the new edition, but this work will hardly have much currency outside of India. Its appearance would be highly discouraging to a beginner.

ative method, it is in most cases the fault, not of the author, but of the orthographical vicissitudes through which the texts have passed. It is frequently impossible to say whether a given variation is merely orthographical or represents a real difference in the language, due to conditions which are not apparent. There is a noticeable difference in method of treatment between Jackson and Bartholomae. In cases where several Avestan characters appear in correspondence with a single Sanskrit sound, Bartholomae usually forms a theory as to the conditions to which the variation is due, and groups the material under rules formed accordingly, each with a note to the effect that exceptions are numerous in the MSS. Bartholomae's work is indispensable to the scholar on account of its attempt to bring some order into the apparent chaos, and a large number of his explanations are undoubtedly correct. But by an arrangement which forces the material into these rules a somewhat distorted picture of the actual facts is produced, and for a grammar which is to serve as a practical text-book, Jackson's more conservative method is to be commended. Undoubtedly a slip is §63, note 3: "Instead of *i* (= *ya*), an *ʔ* appears in Av. *māḍma-* 'midmost' = Skt. *madh-ya-mā-*." If, as has previously been done, we suppose beside *madhyama-* an Aryan \**madh-ama-* = Goth. *miduma-*, the necessity for this note disappears, and *māḍma-* is to be mentioned in §29, with *upamam* = Skt. *upamam*. A résumé of the principal phonological differences between Sanskrit and Avestan is valuable as suggesting to the beginner the parts most necessary to be studied at the outset. Under §197 should be added a reference to the change of *ʔ* to *i* after *y*, §30, and under the heading 'Consonants' a reference to §81 (Av. *ʔ*).

The remaining chapters, on Inflection and Word-formation, follow closely the arrangement of Whitney's Grammar, and abound in references to its corresponding sections. Naturally, there are not a few cases in which there may be a difference of opinion as to the proper classification. In one case which I have noted, the author has been inconsistent in his choice between two current explanations. The infinitives in *-tē* are cited in §254 as datives (cf. Geldner, KZ. 27, 226), in §720, 7 as locatives (cf. Bartholomae, KZ. 28, 21). In the Reader, under *daste* in the vocabulary, reference is made only to §254. In §265, by way of explanation of the locatives in *-vō* from *u*-stems, as *ahmi zantvō* 'in this tribe,' we read "weak stem + *o*, orig. gen.?" This explanation, suggested by Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. I, p. 82, is rightly felt to be extremely doubtful, as *-vō* as a genitive ending is infrequent compared with *-ṣuṣ*, *-aoṣ*, which are not found in locative use. The reviewer suggested in the classroom that these forms are based on the locatives in *ō*, with *v* introduced from the analogy of other cases in which the stem-vowel had retained its identity, as is the case in Skt. *sakhyāu*, *patyāu*, and has since observed that the same view had been briefly expressed by Bartholomae, Indog. Forsch. I, p. 191, note 1, end. A similar instance is the genitive form *darīyōiṣ* mentioned by Jackson, §254.

The Reader is intended to furnish reading material sufficient for one college term. Another volume, to contain longer texts and, doubtless, selections from the Gāthās, which are unrepresented in this first series, is in course of preparation. The selections are intended to be easy, but many of them contain hopeless hapaxlegomena or desperate passages. This is perhaps unavoidable.

A continuous Avestan text of any length which shall be perfectly clear and, at the same time, something more than a tedious repetition of formulas is indeed not easy to find. The notes are excellent, but very brief, the help given by the vocabulary being judged sufficient in most cases. It is unfortunate that the part of the grammar to which the references on points of syntax apply is not yet out. Naturally, even in so small a body of texts, not a few words occur, the interpretation of which is a matter of dispute. An interesting case, in view of recent developments, is that of *uši*. This used to be taken unanimously as a nom. sing. neuter with the meaning 'understanding, intelligence,' which is found in the Modern Persian *hosh*. Some years ago v. Fierlinger, KZ. 27, 335, advanced the theory that the abstract meaning of the modern language was secondary, developed from an older concrete meaning—namely, 'the two ears.' The word would then be related to Lat. *auri-s*, O. B. *uši*, etc., and in form a nom. acc. dual. This view was accepted by Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. II 113; J. Schmidt, Pluralbildung, 109; Johansson, Bz. B. 18, 25; Horn, Grund. d. neupers. Etymologie, s. v. *hosh*; but combatted sharply by Geldner, KZ. 30, 517, who declares that this purely etymological interpretation is tempting but untenable. The old view is also retained by Th. Baunack, Studien, p. 465, and by Jackson in the Reader. This is one of the striking instances of the clashes between those scholars of linguistic and of literary bent. The linguists accepted with open arms an interpretation which seemed to suit the context as well as its predecessor, and at the same time brought the word into connection with other known words, instead of leaving it completely isolated. Geldner, whose almost divinatory powers of interpretation cannot be too highly rated, cares little for strictly linguistic work, and in this case, as elsewhere, makes no secret of his scepticism. But in this case the linguists were right, and their interpretation has been vindicated in a way which Geldner will be the first to recognize. As briefly pointed out by Caland, KZ. 33, 462, the decision is given by a passage in the text Nirangistān, recently published by J. Darmesteter in the third volume of his Avesta translation (= Annales du Musée Guimet, vol. 24). In stanza 26 we find two lines:

"yēzi hvaēibyō ušibyō aiwisrunvaiti ratufriš  
yēzi āat nōiṭ hvaēibya usibya aiwisurunvaiti rapayāt"

which Darmesteter translates:

s'il s'entend de ses propres oreilles, il est agréé,  
s'il ne s'entend pas de ses propres oreilles, qu'il essaie d'atteindre [le bruit].

Of the meaning 'if he hears with his ears' there can be no doubt. In one case the plural form is used, in the other the dual.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Simultaneously with the proof-sheets of the above comes vol. IV of the Indogermanische Forschungen, in which Hübschmann devotes some space to ridding the scientific world of the phantom of an *uši* meaning 'ear.' Darmesteter's translation is frequently cited in support of the meaning 'intelligence,' but, curiously enough, no mention is made of the passage in the fragments. Yet the adherents of v. Fierlinger's view could not have manufactured a text offering more conclusive proof of their claim. That the development of meaning from 'ear' to 'intelligence' may have taken place at an early period, as indicated by the Armenian, is a different thing from the argument of Hübschmann that *uši* had nothing to do with the various I. E. words for 'ear.'

A few minor suggestions on the vocabulary may not be out of place here. The adverb *aētaḥa* 'then, thereupon' is explained as *aētaḥ* + postpos. *a*. Why not *aēta-ḥa*, as Skt. *ta-dā* 'then' and other adverbs in *-dā*? To *anu. pīḥ* *prva-* is given as derivation "*anu* + *√pi*," and as meaning "pursuing." It is not easy to reconcile derivation and interpretation. Skt. *pī* is used of 'swelling up,' often in a proud or combative manner. 'Bristling up,' as suggested by my pupil, Mr. Fowler, would seem to suit the context everywhere (used as epithet of wild boar, and with *-vant*-stem of a kind of head-dress). The form *iṣāṇaphaēta* is not sufficient evidence for a root-form *āh* beside *iṣ*, whatever may be thought of Bartholomae's explanation, Ar. Forsch. II 92. The European cognates of *√iṣ* show that an ablaut like that of Skt. *ṣāḥ* : *ṣiḥ* is out of the question. The meaning 'stouter than an arm' for *bāzu. staoyah-* does not make good sense, and an analogy from Sanskrit compounds would, if I mistake not, be hard to find. If we translate, with Geldner and Darmesteter, 'strong in the arms,' we indeed deny any more than an intensive force to the comparative, but obtain a satisfactory meaning and a compound on a line with Skt. *tanūṣubhra* 'beautiful in body,' etc. The form *huṣṭrafā* is taken in the vocabulary as a nom. sing. of perf. participle, from which, however, we should expect *huṣṭrafāḥ*. In various sections of the grammar and in an article by the author, Amer. Journal of Philology, X, p. 86, the stem is given as *-van(i)-*. Why not give up the idea of a perfect participle and assume suffix *-van*, the only one which would regularly give nominative in *-a*, comparing for meaning the simple participial sense not infrequent in Sanskrit, e. g. *yajvan-* 'offering,' *-jitvan-* 'conquering,' etc.? Whitney, §1169. The etymologies in the vocabulary are confined to forms with the Iranian and Hindu branches. This is to be commended in general, but in a few cases where cognates are wanting here, but undoubtedly to be recognized in the European languages, a departure might not have been amiss. It is almost misleading to find the root *gram* 'to be angry' without etymology, as if it were wholly isolated, instead of being related to *grim*, Goth. *gramjan*, etc. So to *yāsta-* 'girded' a reference to *ζωο-τός* would have supplied the cognate which is wanting in Sanskrit.

In closing we can only desire the speedy appearance of the additional parts of both Grammar and Reader.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

#### A GROUP OF BOOKS ON SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

Die neunzehn Bücher des Mahābhārata (1893); Das Mahābhārata nach der nordindischen Recension (1894), von Dr. ADOLF HOLTZMANN, Professor an der Universität Freiburg i. B. Kiel, Haeseler, 1893, 1894.

These two volumes are the continuation of the first work on the great Hindu epic (Zur Geschichte und Kritik des Mahābhārata, 1892), already reviewed in this Journal (vol. XIII, p. 499). A fourth volume is promised, which is to contain a discussion of the relation of the epic to other Hindu literature, with a review of previous studies in this field.

In the former of the two present volumes Holtzmann gives, in three hundred pages, a compact review of the whole poem. The work will be indispensable to students of the epic, since it is almost impossible, without some such

running commentary, to find one's way through this Indian labyrinth, to which the Neunzehn Bücher will always prove a leading thread. But the book is by no means a table of contents alone; for each division of the subject is furnished with critical and historical apparatus, wherewith one can see what has been done and learn the editor's own views in regard to the originality of each section. For the general student it would perhaps have been more convenient to have the critique in one chapter, but this has been provided for in the other volumes, and there is nothing to object to in the arrangement or space allotted to critical remarks in this useful guide-book. Holtzmann sees at least three recensions in the epic, indicated by the different names traditionally given as relators of the story (p. 153). In respect of one or two important questions the author gives a decided opinion. He regards the original Bhagavadgītā as forming a part of the first poem, and thinks it was Droṇa who first declared it. Pantheistic at first, it became a sectarian (Vishnuite) laud at the hands of the second redactor. As to Christian influence in the account of the 'White Island,' Holtzmann does not believe it is necessary to assume such a source (p. 230). But he believes (as he has said elsewhere more *in extenso*) that he can show Buddhistic influence. The thirteenth and the seventh books appear to be imitations and enlargements of those respectively preceding, while the fourth book is an interpolation. The sixth and ninth books are old, generally speaking, and parts of the first, second and third. A good deal of *scheint* necessarily appears in these short critical notes, and occasionally one may take exception to a judgment wholly subjective, but objective grounds are usually given where they exist, and there is no attempt to urge a preconceived opinion. One of the most dubious conjectures is that at the very beginning, where the books are made eighteen in number either to bring them into conformity with the number of the Purāṇas or with the eighteen days of the war. The reviewer is inclined to think that the coincidence is a pure accident. Other divisions, as the author points out, are found without any external reasons for the division. If, as seems most probable, the Anuśāsana was not added till long after the Çānti, and this was also a parasitic growth, it is quite as plausible that these two parts were, like the Harivaṇṣa (now the nineteenth book), subsequently added to the formal divisions as they now exist; in which case the division would have been at first not into eighteen, but sixteen or (counting out the Virāṭa) fifteen books.

The Mahābhārata nach der nordindischen Recension reviews the different editions of the epic and is intended only for special students. The editions are taken up in their chronological order: first that of Calcutta (1834-39); then that of Bombay, from 1862-63, which has about two hundred more verses than the former edition and contains the commentary of Nīlakaṇṭha. Holtzmann (p. 12) agrees with the reviewer's opinion, expressed in 1888 (Am. Or. Soc. Proceedings), that the extra verses in B are more apt to represent interpolations in this edition than lacunae in C. Other less known editions of the Mahābhārata are reviewed, with an account of the manuscripts at present accessible. Both B and C are based on Nīlakaṇṭha's text; besides which there is another, that of Arjunamiśra, and, opposed to these two, a shorter South-Indian recension (p. 32). The Harivaṇṣa and the poem of Jaimini (*bhārata*) are discussed in the following pages [Is the work described in the



Notices, 2040, Harivaṅṣa Purāṇa, intended in the description on p. 40?], together with the Bālabhārata, that is the epic without the episodes, or 'baby-Bhārata.' The various selections and compendia of the epic then receive attention. Some of these are Jain works, a Pāṇḍavacarita, etc.; which, though all have a certain interest, are yet all of little importance so far as goes critique of the original text. The reviewer has a note on a *mahākāvya* called *kicakabaddha* (615), which he does not find in this list (p. 44 ff.). Anthologies and translations of the epic (including Edwin Arnold) are briefly noted, and finally there is a special chapter on the commentaries, some being known to us only by hearsay. The remarks on Nilakaṇṭha, including a discussion of the portions apparently lacking in his commentary, are very useful, if only to show at a glance what these are.

There are other Mahābhāratas, written not in Sanskrit but in Hindustani, Hindi, etc. The glory of the literature found in the Mahrathi language is found in translations from the Mahābhārata (p. 102); in Dravidian there are translations and poems based on the epic (imitations); and the same is true in regard to the Canarese and even the Malay languages. Java has also its pretended epic. Of foreign translations are mentioned those into Persian and Tibetan.

For its purpose this book is all that could be desired. The reviewer regrets that the author did not see fit to establish his statement on p. 13 (that B has more verses that are lacking in C than has C verses lacking in B) by a printed list in the form of an appendix. This would be a great convenience to epic students and might properly be printed in such a volume, whereas no Oriental journal seems willing to find place for a table of comparative varied readings (or omissions). Thirty three-column pages would give not only this but the equation of numbers, and every student of the epic would be thankful for the saving of his time and patience. If a stereotyped form were employed, these notes would take no more space than a number, e. g. 3. 70, *a* = omits, under columns headed III, B and C; whereas to get such a simple thing printed independently costs between one and two hundred dollars, so that each student must continue to go through this tedious operation for himself. But perhaps a humane body of editors will some day utilize what has already been done for the benefit of those that hesitate to spend a whole summer traversing so arid a desert as this. If so, they may be sure that they will receive the blessing due to the giver of the cup of cool water.

In conclusion it should be said that whatever be the defects of this work, it would be almost ungracious to emphasize them, in view of the practical use and great convenience of the book. Holtzmann has given us a very handy volume—one that materially benefits the epic student. The labor must have been great in preparing it, and the author deserves to receive the hearty thanks of Sanskrit scholars.

Die Çukasaptati, Textus Simplicior, aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt, von RICHARD SCHMIDT. 1894.

The reviewer has not received the original, though it is, he believes, now published. The preaching parrot is a favorite character in India, from the epic down. The Çukasaptati is very far down. A septuagint of parrot-stories, chiefly silly, sometimes indecent, which are related to prevent an

indiscreet woman from becoming an adulteress—such is the vacuous contents. As an example of *märchen* literature the work is valuable, but it requires a taste cultivated in such extravaganza to appreciate these childish vulgar tales. Not one of the seventy shows wit or cleverness. They may be edifying, but they could amuse only a harem, and the harem might object to the edification. One wonders who ever took a real pleasure in reading them. For seventy days this tireless parrot, by means of tiresome stories, continues to persuade a wicked woman to behave herself. Then the husband returns, the parrot (who was under a curse) takes his real form, going to heaven, and the delighted husband lives happy ever after with his now moral wife. The translator promises us another volume, containing the *textus ornatior* and a Mahrathi translation.

Das Kathākāutukam des Ṣrīvara. RICHARD SCHMIDT. 1893.

This is an examination of Ṣrīvara's work compared with Jāmi's, with examples of the two texts, the critical question being whether the Sanskrit is a 'making-over' or a translation of the Persian. Schmidt shows that Ṣrīvara takes complete verses from Jāmi, but that he independently composes (as well as omits) whole new episodes. The illustrations and the review of each chapter prove how divergent are the two authors. In description alone, not to speak of events, there is a great difference. It is to be hoped that the editor will soon give us the whole poem, as he here promises to do, though one almost begrudges the time spent on imitations of imitations, considering how much original Sanskrit is still unpublished.

Materialien zur Geschichte der indischen Visionslitteratur, von LUCIAN SCHERMAN. 1892.

Scherman's 'Philosophische Hymnen' has been followed by another interesting study, on later phases of eschatology in their connection with the earlier belief. His present pamphlet (though it is one of 161 pages) is furnished copiously with notes, and will prove a very useful addition to the literature of the subject. The author contends that Yama was not a nature-myth originally (p. 149), with which we agree, though we object to our own previous *suggestion* being looked upon as an argument 'impossible to prove' (p. 143), as no proof was intended. We disagree with the author, however, when he claims that the usual interpretation of Yama in ancient and more modern times respectively is incorrect. There are traces of the old belief of a heavenly Yama in later poetry, but the usual view is decidedly opposed to the Vedic one. In the epic the prevailing hope of the warrior is still for a happy heaven 'with Indra'; the bad are 'sent to Yama,' i. e. to hell. Yet does dim recollection of Yama as a king of all the dead still survive. He is practically reduced to a hell- and judgment-god, however, except in some portions of the epic, where he is so shadowy a creature that one must suppose later imagination to be at work, a poetic imagination not in touch with popular belief, as in the late description of Yama's heaven (*sabhā*) in the second book of the Mahābhārata. But we can recommend Scherman's sketch to any one interested in the subject, for it is the most complete and thorough presentation of the theme that has been published.

E. W. HOPKINS.

## REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, Vol. XLVII.

Pp. 1-52, 515-49. At the time when E. Klebs published his articles on the collection of the *Scriptores hist. Aug.* (vol. XLV, 436 ff.; A. J. P. XII 375), Seek had prepared a paper on the same subject, agreeing with Klebs in rejecting Mommsen's theory of a recension by a final redactor (*Hermes*, 1890, 228-92; A. J. P. XII 379-80), but raising, on his part, the question whether the whole collection was genuine, or a literary fraud. Seek attempted to prove the latter; but Klebs again comes to the rescue and repudiates the charge of fraud by examining (1) the asserted errors in the description of institutions existing at the time of Diocletian and Constantine; (2) their relation to other historical documents, and (3) the general literary character of the whole collection. To this third point the writer devotes the greater part of his long article, showing that (1) the collection is the work of several authors, and not that of a single late forger, the agreement in language and style being rather that of people belonging to the same class than that of one and the same writer; (2) the theory of a later recension of the whole collection is without foundation, and (3) the usual grammatical and critical method of treating the collection as a perfectly homogeneous work is not warranted. Certain groups of biographies, especially the work of Flavius Vopiscus, have their peculiarities in language, style and matter. Ed. Wölfflin (*Sitzungsberichte der k. bayr. Akad. der Wiss.*, 1891, 465-528),<sup>1</sup> advancing beyond Klebs, attempts to prove (1) that the documents quoted by Trebellius and Vopiscus were mostly their own productions, and (2) that Vopiscus had arranged the order of the whole corpus, and had enlarged the biographies written by his predecessors, with minor additions of his own. On pp. 515-49 Klebs concludes his articles with a linguistic argument as to the identity of the writings of Trebellius Pollio and Aelius Spartianus. There were altogether six different authors of the *Historia Augusta*, a fact proving to Klebs the genuineness of these writings. An appendix contains a discussion on the Sallustianisms of the S. H. A., and a postscript (540-9) considers three of the points in which Wölfflin differs from Klebs.

Pp. 52-60. W. Judeich denies that Aristotle's 'Αθ. πολ., §3, proves the *βουλευτήριον*, i. e. the official residence of the archon Basileus, to have been in the Lenaeum, and the *Δήναιον ἐν Δίμναις* itself to have been situated not south of the Acropolis, beyond the old Thesean city in the plain of the Ilissus, but in the northwestern part of Athens, in the neighborhood of the Dipylon, as has been recently maintained by Dörpfeld (*Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift*, 1890, col. 461) and E. Maas (*Index schol. Gryphiswald.* 1891-92).

<sup>1</sup> See also Wölfflin's *Archiv*, VIII 307; H. Dessau, *Hermes*, 1892, 561; Herman Peter, *Die Scriptores hist. Aug.*, Leipzig, 1892.

Pp. 61-73. O. Crusius continues his 'ad scriptores latinos exegetica' (see vol. XLIV 460; A. J. P. XI 385). (21) Ennius was a Greek by birth (Festus, 293 a, m.); 'Ev-vnos = is qui habitat ἐν νῆϊ, νῆϊ being = νειῶ; (22) The *Sacra historia Euhemeri* was a prose rendering, not a metrical translation of Ennius; (23) Cato's 'praecepta ad filium' did not have the title 'oracula,' as Schoell believed, the 'oracula' quoted by Pliny and Priscian being ancient proverbs and sayings collected by Cato; (24) Defence of his interpretation of Hor. Epod. V 29-35 (A. J. P. XI 386) against H. Diels, showing that the same custom prevails to this day among the Batakas on Sumatra; (25) Hor. Epist. II 1, 79 *crocum floresque recte perambulare* = *plausu excipi* or *probari*; (26) Ovid, Fast. II 108 ff., is perhaps an imitation of Aesch. frag. 139, 45 (schol. Aristoph. Avv. 808); (27) Mart. I 61 read *syllabos*, i. e. *indices*, which, again, may be a corruption of *sillybos*; (28) Hilberg's reading, Mart. Xen. XIII 34, *saturæia potest* instead of *satur esse potes*, is incorrect.

Pp. 74-113. P. Cauer. In the Homeric poems, as well as in the *Nibelungenlied*, we often notice a lack of or defect in 'logical perspective,' which appears to be due to a weakness of memory on the part of epic poets in general. Certain peculiarities of expression, e. g. parataxis, are imperfections that must here be taken into consideration. The poet sometimes loses sight of the plan of the whole poem when he endeavors to push a single detail. This explains a great many contradictions, and does away with most of Kirchhoff's Lachmannian theories of the gradual growth and the several lays of the poems. Grammatical analysis of the epic language, investigation into the historical background, interpretation of Homeric mythology, and other lines of study must help us to gain a faithful and true picture of the gradual growth of the Epos, in the place of the prevailing ingenious but fanciful theories.

Pp. 114-29. J. Schmidt writes on the alba of the ordo of Thamugadi and the *flamonium perpetuum*. The list of officers in the *albus ordinis coloniae Thamugadensis* (Numidia), published by Mommsen in the *Ephem. Epigr. III* 77, is now completed by six fragments found recently, which prove (1) that aediles and quaestores had seat and vote in the curia, after the expiration of their term of office, and (2) that the *flamines perpetui* were former *flamines curiales*, to whom this honorary title was given at the end of their year's service.

Pp. 130-7. A. Elter publishes from Cod. Vatic. Gr. 1144 (saec. XV) 30 fragments of the *Florilegium* of Johannes Stobaeus, belonging mostly to the missing chapters of book II. Additional remarks on pp. 629-33.

Pp. 138-51. F. Skutsch proves a mesodic arrangement of lines 41-148 of the 68th poem of Catullus. The centre is formed by ll. 91-100 (the death of the brother); ll. 87-90 and 101-4 describe scenes from the Trojan war; ll. 73-86 and 105-18 treat of Laodameia; ll. 57-72 and 119-34 contain two similes; Lesbica; ll. 51-6 and 135-40 speak of Catullus' love; while ll. 41-50 form the initium and ll. 141-8, with the two missing verses after 141, the conclusio. On the construction of the whole poem, Skutsch sides with the 'Unitarians.'

Pp. 152-60. F. Rühl defends the MS reading νεώτερον of [Arist.] 'Αθ. πολ., c. 26, p. 26 K., against Kontos' νωρότερον and Weil's νωθέστερον or ἐνεώτερον.

—Wilamowitz-Möllendorf's emendation of Thuc. VIII 67, 2 ἀζήμιον εἰπεῖν against the usual Ἀθηναίων ἀνειπεῖν is unnecessary, because Ἀθ. πολ., c. 82, shows that we must retain Ἀθηναίων and add τοῖς βουλευμένοις or τοῖς ἐθέλονσι.—H. Usener highly commends Max Fränkel's edition of the Pergamenian inscriptions (vol. I, Berlin, 1890), and interprets No. 246 of this collection, which contains a decree of the city of Elaia conferring divine honors upon Attalus III.—F. Marx. The Auctor ad Herennium, desiring to explain the meaning of the ἐπιτροχασμός, must have written, IV 54, 68: Lemnum prae-teriens cepit, inde Ghasi praesidium reliquit, post urbem Viminacium sustulit, inde pulsus in Hellespontum statim potitur Abydi. Marx finds here the earliest mention of Viminacium, a city of Moesia Superior, situated on the Danube.—A. v. Domaszewski explains, with the help of an inscription recently found in Transylvania, the nocturni of Petronius, 15, as identical with the tres viri capitales.

Pp. 161-206. H. Nissen holds that the πολιτεῖαι of Aristotle were intended to lead up to the publication of a law code for the empire of Alexander, and at the same time to serve as a series of handbooks for the use of Macedonian diplomatists. (See, however, Bruno Keil, Die Solonische Verfassung, pp. 127-50.) With the help of the extant fragments, Nissen defines, on pp. 189-92, the titles of 98 treatises. The πολιτεία was not completed before the beginning of 323 B. C.

Pp. 207-18. A. v. Domaszewski discusses the displacement of the Roman army, in the year 66 of our era. The report of Josephus, Bell. Jud. II 16, 4, is shown by inscriptions to be true and reliable. We must not forget that whenever one or more of the seven Roman legions were displaced, there always remained behind a company or two and auxiliary troops.

Pp. 219-40. O. Hense believes Philo, in his tract περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον, to have made use, besides a Stoic source, of an essay, περὶ δουλείας, by Bion. Hense's article was occasioned by Richard Ausfeld's dissertation on this tract of Philo (Göttingen, 1887), to which Wilamowitz-Möllendorf had added a number of text-critical remarks.

Pp. 241-68. O. E. Schmidt publishes additions and corrections to an article 'on the outbreak of the civil war in B. C. 49,' by H. Nissen (Sybel's Historische Zeitschrift, vols. 44 and 46). Caesar reckoned the *initium tumultus* from the time when Pompey placed himself in command over the army, i. e. upon his arrival in the camp at Luceria, about Dec. 16, B. C. 50. The *decretum tumultus* is not the same as the *senatus consultum ultimum*, but a preliminary step to the actual proscription, integral parts of which were the *iustitium* and *saga sumere*. This was the Roman senate's answer to Caesar's invasion of Italy.

Pp. 269-90. F. Blass. Studies in Demosthenes (continued from vol. XLIV, 430; A. J. P. XI 107 f.). IV. Future present and aor. future. Starting from the usage of φαίνωμαι and φανήσομαι, B. shows that the difference in the future, middle and passive lies not so much in the *genus verbi* as in their temporal character, that we must distinguish between the *futurum praesentis* (or durative future) and *futurum aoristi* (or aoristic future), which in Greek is often



expressed by special forms of the verb. Blass believes that the present arrangement of the paradigm of verbs must be changed,<sup>1</sup> the two main groups being the active and the passive voices, while the middle is only an appendix. So also must the order of tenses be altered to present, imperfect, future (these three representing the durative action in the present, past and future); then aorist, perfect and pluperfect. The future perfect (*futurum exactum*) has no place in the active, because *έστήξω* belongs to the passive, as well as *τεθνήξω*, the latter, with all the forms of *θνήσκω*, being the passive voice of *κτείνω*. In the passive the three futures follow immediately after their respective preterites.

Pp. 291-311. W. Fröhner sends a first instalment of emendations and interpretations of Greek and Latin authors, which, on account of their great simplicity, are very convincing.

Pp. 312-18. M. Ihm. There are two recensions of the *Hippiatrica*, the one, preserved in the edition of Grynaeus (Basle, 1537) and in some good old MSS, while the other is found in Cod. Paris. 2322 (saec. XI). It is by no means certain that the work in its present form was composed under Constantine VII, Porphyrogenetus (med. saec. X), all indications pointing to an earlier date. These *των ιππιατρικων βιβλια δυο*, consisting of verbatim extracts from the earlier authors on farriery, are of much greater value than the *γεωπονικα* (on which see E. Oder, Rhein. Mus. XLV 58-99; A. J. P. XI 373).

Pp. 319-28. A. Gercke believes that the remarks on Menedemus preserved in Diog. Laert. II 40, are based on the Alexandrian satyr-drama, 'Menedemus,' which Lycophron composed to ridicule his countryman and contemporary, Menedemus, the Eretrian philosopher (Athen. II 55).—C. de Boor. Niebuhr saw long ago that the *νεα εκδοσις* of Eunapius was but an expurgated edition of the original work, arranged by a speculative bookseller of a later date. It was to form a part of a great universal history on the plan of the *Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen*.—W. Dittenberger emends ll. 4 and 5 of the inscription treated by Gardthausen (vol. XLVI, 619 f.), and discusses another published by Schliemann (Athen. Mittheilungen, 1890, p. 217, No. 2), which refers to Emperor Tiberius.—J. Schmidt corrects and explains the text of an edict of Ulpius Mariscianus on the 'postulatio,' published by Mommsen in *Ephem. Epigr.* V 630 f.

Pp. 329-58. K. Buresch emends a number of passages in bb. III-XIII of the Pseudo-Sibylline oracles.

Pp. 359-89. R. Hirzel. The peculiarity of Theopompus always to examine into cause and origin of the passions and crimes of human society, his aversion to Plato, and his admiration of Aristippus show the cynic tendency in his philosophy. This also explains the insertion of myths and the moralizing tone of the whole historical work.

Pp. 390-403. S. Brandt. The Phoenix of Lactantius, which, on account of its pagan mythology, has often been ascribed to another author, may after all be the work of Lactantius; for it is well-nigh impossible to assume that any writer should have published such a work under the name of Lactantius. It

<sup>1</sup> See Kühner-Blass, *Theil I*, 2. Bd., S. 585.

is probably a poetical digression composed by its author when he was yet a pagan youth.

Pp. 404-13. H. Rabe publishes and interprets the *Lexicon Messanense de iota ascripto* from the Codex S. Salvatoris 118 of the royal library at Messina, saec. XIII. The work is arranged alphabetically, and abounds in quotations and excerpts on words with *ἡ προσγεγραμμένον*.

Pp. 414-56. MM. Holleaux, P. Paris and others collected at Oinoanda, in Lycia, some 33 inscriptions, being the literary legacy of Diogenes, an old Epicurean philosopher of the third century of our era, in which, addressing his friend Antipatros and others, he explains the doctrines of the Epicurean school, and endeavors to win, even after his death, converts to these doctrines by declaring that he gained happiness and peace in them. These inscriptions were carefully edited by M. G. Cousin in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, XVI (Jan.-Mar. 1892), pp. 1-70. H. Usener now publishes these texts again, with many suggestive remarks and critical notes, in order to make them more accessible to German readers and, at the same time, to correct some false deductions of Cousin's from Usener's Epicurea. Especially noteworthy is a letter of Epicurus addressed to his mother.

Pp. 457-72. W. Kroll gives a preliminary list of MSS needed for a reliable edition of the *ποίησις πάνν ὀφέλιμος* of Pseudo-Phocylides.—F. Rühl. Theophrastus, speaking of the olive-oracle of Thessalus, the son of Peisistratus (H. Pl. II 3, 7), did not mean a permanent oracular medium, as E. Curtius, *Stadtgeschichte von Athen*, p. 70, believes, but only a single omen which was not repeated.—R. Jahnke discovered a new vita of Ovid on the front page of the last leaf of an old book in the city library at Hamburg. Author and date are entirely unknown.—C. Hosius. The authors of Late Latin inscriptions frequently borrow quotations from Latin writers; thus, e. g., C. I. L. VI 11252 is taken from Seneca, *de remed. fortuit.* II 1 (II, p. 447, Haase).—M. Manitius. The language of Curtius betrays remarkable resemblance to and agreement with that of Velleius; on the other hand, there are many similarities in style and language with Curtius in the writings of Florus. Appended is a list of works intended or mapped out by Velleius, but probably never executed.—W. Sternkopf believes that there were two 'supplicationes' in honor of Pompey, after the bellum Mithridaticum (cf. Cic. de prov. cons. II, 27), one lasting 10 days (in B. C. 63) and the other 12 days (in B. C. 62).

Pp. 473-88. M. Fränkel. According to Arist., *Ἀθ. πολ.* IV 2 (edd. Kaibel et Wilamowitz-Möllendorf), the constitution of Draco decreed that the Prytanes should be chosen from those possessed of land producing yearly 500 medimni (*πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι*); that the archons and *ταμίαι* should be taken from the knights (*ἱππεῖς*); while the generals of the army (*στρατηγοί*) and commanders of cavalry (*ἵππαρχοι*) might belong to the *ζευγίται*, the third of Solon's four classes of Athenian citizens. The Prytanes had originally also the care of the treasury and the military equipment, as well as the oversight of the disbursement of the public funds; their subordinates were the comptrollers (*ταμίαι*), the chief householders (*ναύκραροι*) and the collectors (*κωλακρέται*). For the finances they associated with themselves the *στρατηγοί*

and ἱππαρχοί. The εἰθύνη, or public account rendered by all officers at the expiration of their term of office, existed as early as the time of Draco.

Pp. 489-514. J. Ilberg. On the writings of Claudius Galenus of Pergamum. II (see A. J. P. XI 110). An examination of Galen's anatomical and physiological works, and of his personal history, shows that he studied in Pergamum from A. D. 147-151, and in Smyrna since that time. His first visit to Rome falls between A. D. 164-168; here he dedicated a number of tracts to Flavius Boethus, Teuthras and Antisthenes. The second sojourn there was under Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus (A. D. 169 ff.).

Pp. 550-7. E. Kirchner. There were ten districts in the phyle of Antigonis, and only nine in that of Demetrias.

Pp. 558-68. L. Traube has a new interpretation of the *sententiae sapientium qui fuerunt in convivio cum metello* (= *M. Tullio*), the Latin version of the sayings of the seven wise men. This version is contained in the collection of excerpts made by Heiric of Auxerre, which his famous teacher, Lupus of Ferrières (med. saec. IX), dictated to him and then presented to Bishop Hildebold of Soissons, between the years 871-6. It comprises 23 *sententiae*, divided among seven famous Romans, viz. Crassus, 1-3; Catullus, 4-7; Crassus again, 8-12; Scipio, 13-15; Laelius, 16-17; Rusticius, 18-20; Cicero, 21-23. These excerpts are based on the collection of Demetrius (apud Stobaeum), 1-13 referring to Cleobulus, Solon, Chilon, Thales, 18 to Bias, and 21-22 to Periander. The remainder of the Latin text consists in later additions.

Pp. 569-76. L. Radermacher. The Ajax and Odysseus of Antisthenes are merely prose renderings ('declamationes') of *ῥήσεις* of tragedies, so that Antisthenes cannot be considered an original author. The two works seem to be based on a post-Euripidean tragedy, treating the *δῶλων κρίσις*, and the original metrical form can easily be restored.

Pp. 577-96. E. Bethe. Studies in Vergil. II (continued from vol. XLVI, 527). The I and IX Eclogues are each composed of two distinct, separate parts, one of which is based on Vergil's own condition of life and experiences, while the other, holding itself entirely aloof from such conditions, presupposes the ideal pastoral life. In like manner does the VIII Eclogue consist of three separate parts. O. Ribbeck adds remarks on the interpretation of this poem.

Pp. 598-627. W. Kroll publishes, from a palimpsest in the library at Turin (cod. Fvii, foll. 64; 67; 90-4 *obv.* and *rev.*; together 14 columns of 35 lines each; saec. VI), the Greek text of a neo-Platonic commentary on Parmenides, with additional explanatory notes. The text was copied by the late W. Studemund in 1878, but pressure of work and his early death prevented the great Latinist from publishing the tract.

Pp. 628-44. O. Ribbeck. On the distribution of Herondas, I 81-8, III 58-97.—A. Elter. On the new fragments of Stobaeus, and on the proverbs of Euagrius of Pontus, from the Leyden Codex Voss. Gr. 4to, No. 18.—K. Dziatzko. The assertion of Hauler (Wiener Studien, XI 268 ff.), that the handwriting of the *corrector recens* in the Bembinus MS of Terence dates from saec.

VIII/IX, rather than saec. XV, is erroneous. The same is the case with Gutjahr's identification of Calliopius with Alcuin (Ber. der k. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl., 1891, pp. 265-94). The MS from which the Victorianus of Terence was copied must have been an illustrated MS.—J. S. Speyer proposes to read Juvenal, III 238 *eripiant somnum surdo*; and F. Becher omits *aliquid* after *id autem est* in Cicero pro Deiot. 13, 35.—E. Wölflin. Quintilian's judgment on Demosthenes and Cicero (X 1, 106) must originally have read: *curae plus in hoc, in illo naturae*.—C. Weyman. Zeno, Bishop of Verona (†380), made use of the Phoenix and the Institutiones of Lactantius.

A supplement of 152 pages contains philological extracts and notices from old library-catalogues collected by M. Manitius. It is a very welcome and useful compilation on the basis of Gottlieb's famous book, *Ueber mittelalterliche Bibliotheken* (Leipzig, 1890, pp. 520). We hear of the wanderings of MSS and the diffusion of knowledge of the Greek and Latin authors in France, Germany, England, Italy and other countries of Europe, from the early Middle Ages down to saec. XIII. Of the greatest importance is the index of authors, showing us at a glance which were in those days the favorite authors whose works were read by many. Thus we find Petronius frequently mentioned, but Phaedrus is not represented. Numerous notes and remarks are added for the guidance and instruction of the reader of this most valuable contribution, especially noteworthy being the excursus on Celsus, on the Phoenix of Lactantius, on Julius Valerius and on Aurelius Victor.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

---

HERMES, 1892.

### III.

C. Trieber, *Die Idee der vier Weltreiche*. T. shows that the idea of the four universal empires was advanced by a Greek soon after the defeat of Antiochus of Syria by the Romans at Magnesia. The fact that the author of the idea followed the Attic date of Troy shows that he was independent of Eratosthenes and the Alexandrian School, and that hence he must have been a Pergamenian or a Rhodian. Varro seems to have remarked that Rome began just about the time when the Assyrian Empire ended. Soon after Varro, Dionysius in his introduction presented the idea of the succession of the four universal empires; Pompeius Trogus constructs his entire work on this foundation; but it was Jerome who, in his commentary on Daniel, gained universal acceptance for it. The date assigned by Cato (Dionys. Hal. Antiqq. Rom. I 74) to the founding of Rome was 751 B. C. Cato was followed by Velleius, Apion, Eusebius-Jerome and Frontinus, but not by Solinus, even though the latter expressly mentions the first year of the seventh olympiad as the date of the founding of Rome.

K. Bürger, *Der antike Roman vor Petronius*. In 1890, G. Thiele, in an article entitled 'Zum griechischen Roman,' made a partially unsuccessful attempt to show that the realistic novel which is exemplified to a remarkable degree of perfection in the *Saturae* of Petronius is found on Greek soil also. Bürger attempts to supply additional evidence of this fact. He argues that

so perfect a work as that of Petronius must have had a string of predecessors, but that Varro's Menippean satires cannot be counted among this number. In fact, the close correspondence in the art of realistic portraiture between the mimetic poems of Theocritus and the mimiambi of Herondas on the one hand, and Petronius on the other, would seem to point to a Greek origin of the technic of this species of writing. B. claims that the realistic novel must have flourished between 100 B. C. and 100 A. D. Contrary to the views of Rohde and Christ, he proves that the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides was a single novel (*Roman*), and not a collection of separate stories (*Novellen*). Ovid also mentions a Eubius *impurae conditor historiae* and a Sybaritis. From Greece the novel was brought to Italy by Sisenna, the translator of Aristides' *Μιλησιακά*, and reached its highest state of development in the work of Petronius.

K. Bürger, *Epilogische Volkswitze in den Fabelsammlungen*. Bürger calls attention to the fact that in the collections hitherto made of this species of popular wit, those examples have been overlooked which by making the epilogue precede have been turned into fables.

E. Meyer, *Homerische Parerga*. 1. Der älteste Homertext. Among the Flinders Petrie Papyri there is a fragment containing portions of Il. A 502-37. Though extremely fragmentary, enough of the text has been preserved to reveal a number of variants, of the existence of five of which nothing had been known up to that time. From the date of this fragment and the nature of the variants, M. draws the following conclusions: The composition of the Iliad antedates all variants. It would be wrong to infer that the large proportion of uncertain lines in our fragment was characteristic of Homer as a whole. The text of Aristophanes, Aristarchus, our MSS and our editions is in the main the text as constituted by Zenodotus. The Alexandrian critics followed the readings of the better class of MSS, noting only the variants found in them, and entirely ignoring those of the inferior MSS.

2. Theseus bei Homer. Meyer takes up anew the question of the genuineness of Homer A 265, and, contrary to Wilamowitz-M., reaches the conclusion that the ancients were right in rejecting the verse as spurious. He believes that its introduction here, as well as in Hesiod, Sc. H. 182, was due to Attic influence.

3. Apollofest am Neumondtage. Meyer shows that in Samos, the day of the new moon was a festival of Apollo.

4. Der Wettkampf Homers und Hesiods. Meyer claims that Aristophanes Pax 1282 f. are verses of the *ἄγων*, and that this is the best proof that has as yet been given of the antiquity of the latter work.

Joh. Geffcken, *Saturnia Tellus*. G. surveys a number of elaborate eulogies of the soil and resources of Italy. The one in Strabo, VI 286, he deduces from Polybius. The one in Dionys. Hal. Antiqq. Rom. I 36 sq. he traces to Varro, comparing also Pliny, III 41-2 and Vergil, Georg. II 136 sqq. Polybius was used to a certain extent by Varro also.

M. Wellmann, *Juba, eine Quelle des Aelian*. W. shows Juba to have been almost the only source from which Aelian drew his various accounts regarding elephants. He further makes it appear probable that Aelian diligently consulted Juba in reference to other matters also, and that in particular Aelian's stories about Mauretanian animals are derived from that same author.



F. Noack, *Die erste Aeneis Vergils*. This paper is divided into six sections. In the first the writer, upon the basis of his own researches and the investigations of others that preceded him, shows that books III and V of the Aeneid, while composed independently of II and IV and IV and VI, and at a later date than I, VII, VIII and possibly also XI and XII, could not well have been written after books IX and X, but that they, conjointly with IX and X, belong to the closing years of the poet's life. In sections 2, 3 and 4 it is shown how, from the point of view of chronology, contents, and comparison with Homer, books I, II, IV and VI form a closer union. Section 5 treats of the sources of the Aeneid, and another proof of the essential unity of books I, II, IV and VI is presented. Book I, the close of II, IV and a portion of VI are all derived from a common source, Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*. In the sixth and last section, Noack goes still further, and maintains not only that books I, II, IV and VI originally formed a complete unit, but also that they constituted the first draft of the Aeneid, except that perhaps where III and V were later introduced, a short account of the wanderings of Aeneas was inserted. The twelve books that we now possess are the result of a later attempt of Vergil's, involving a hard and prolonged study of the mass of Roman and Italic legends. By the introduction of this new material and the insertion of books III and V the unity of the composition was lost to a certain extent and a number of inconsistencies were introduced, so much so that Vergil lost courage and ordered the work to be destroyed after his death. The plan of the larger work had been matured in 25 B. C., but when called upon by Augustus, between 23 and 22 B. C., to read a portion of his poem, the poet selected the choicest parts of his original draft, having added to book VI the lines on Marcellus to suit the occasion.

P. Stengel, *Zum Saecularorakel*. Stengel defends the reading *αἰσία δέχθω θύματα* of verse 17 f. of the oracle found in Diels, *Sibyll. Bl.* 134, against the reading *ἰσα δεδέχθω θύματα* 'Ελευθιῆσιν' proposed by Wilamowitz and adopted by Th. Mommsen. In view of a remark of Zosimus, the question arises as to whether it was lawful to burn expiatory offerings upon altars. The question is answered in the affirmative, but with the limitation that either such altars might not be used for any other kind of offering or they were erected simply *ad hoc* and used but once.

F. Noack, *Die Quellen des Tryphiodoros*. N. claims that Tryphiodorus obtained almost all of his material from Quintus Smyrnaeus, Vergil and Homer.

U. Wilcken, *Ein Actenstück zum jüdischen Kriege Trajans*. This paper contains a new edition and a thorough discussion of Paris Papyrus 68, which was published for the first time in 1865, by Brunet de Presle, in *Notices et Extraits*, XVIII 2, p. 383 ff. The new text is based upon a collation, made by the editor in 1887, of the *editio princeps* with the original Paris MS. Wilcken has been able to supply a large number of new readings, and seems to have arrived at a much truer understanding of the nature of the document than his predecessor. He proves pretty conclusively that the papyrus in question relates to the Jewish rebellion in the reign of Trajan, and that it records an interview between the Emperor and a delegation of Jews. The

interview probably took place at Antioch, in 117 A. D. In connection with the Paris Papyrus, W. also gives a new ed. of a London papyrus referring to the same event. The London fragment is published in *Greek Papyri in the Br. Mus.* XLIII.

## IV.

M. Mayer, *Mythistorica*. I. Megarische Sagen. M. thinks that the inscription *Fovs* on an ancient Corinthian vase at Breslau is the name of the large owl-shaped bird with woman's face that is represented on that vase as one of the companions of Athena. He transliterates it *Fōvs*, and identifies it with Hesych. *πῶνξ*, Aristot. *φῶνξ*, Et. M. *βοῦγξ*. But *αἰθνια*, according to Et. M., is another name for *βοῦγξ*, and Pausanias tells of an Athena *Αἰθνια*. Hence the association of the bird with the goddess. *Αἰθνια* is also the name of a cliff on the coast of Megara. Here Pandion, the father-in-law of Tereus, was buried. This gives rise to a number of etymological, geographical and ethnological speculations, centering about the names Pandion and Tereus. Pandion is connected with Pandaros, Pandares, Pandareos and the Pandoi, and Tereus is connected with the Thracian Treres. Tereus (Thuc. 2, 29, 3) ruled at Daulis, then inhabited by Thracians. Daulis was named after Daulieus, and is connected with Daunis and the Daunians, of whom there are but a few traces. Possibly the name Danaoi, which was early applied to the Greeks, caused the disappearance of the original form.

II. Jacar, Kephalos and the Karians. *Jacor* is the name applied to Memnon on a Praenestine cista, Mon. d. Inst. VI 54. Mayer identifies this with Hesych. *ιακάρ*, which is explained as *ὁ κύων ἀστήρ*. Memnon was the morning star, *Ἑωσφόρος*, *Ἑωσφόρος*, the son of Eos. The dog-star version is found in the story of Ikarios and his dog Maira. For to Mayer, Jakar, Ikaros and Ikarios are all cognate forms. From Ikaros there is but a step to the *Κῆρες*, and this leads to a discussion of Kephalos and the Karians, and the relationship existing between the Karians, Leleges and the Pelasgians. Leleges is considered a reduplicated form and identical with Lycians. The Karians and Leleges are closely interwoven, but a wide gulf seems to have separated the two from the Pelasgians. The name of Agamemnon, the leader of the Western Greeks, was formed with direct reference to Memnon-Jakar, the leader of the East.

III. Catamitus. The writer proposes a new etymology for Catamitus, which was supposed to have been a corrupt Latin form for *Γανυμήδης*. Mayer thinks that Catamitus is a mixture of *κατάμηλος*—*καδμήλος* and *Μίτος*. *Μίτος*, it is suggested, was possibly the name of the boy that was the cup-bearer of the Kabiros, though on the Theban vase (Mitth. d. Ath. Inst. 1888, Taf. IX) the name is applied not to the cup-bearer, but to a satyr-like young man. In Samothrace the cup-bearer was called Kadmilos. Nonnos gives the form *Καδμήλος*. *Μίτος* is supposed to be connected with *μίτυλος*, *μικκός*, *μιστύλλω*, and *Καδμήλος* is *κατάμηλος* (= *ἐπιμήλιος*, *νόμιος*), the god of the herd = Hermes.

P. Viereck, *Urkunden aus dem Archiv von Arsinoe vom Jahre 248 n. Chr.* This paper contains the text and a thorough discussion of Papyrus N. 1506 of the Berlin Museum. The documents are from the archives of Arsinoe. They belong to the year 247/248 A. D., and seem, all of them, to refer to the

collection of taxes. New proof is afforded of the fact that members of the council of Arsinoe did service in the matter of the levying of taxes in the country districts, and we learn that these councillors were appointed by the president of the council. It seems tolerably certain also that it was the duty of these councillors, in connection with the nomarchs, to determine the amount of the assessment, and probably the expression *διὰ ψηφικῶν λόγων* (= Lat. per rationes calculatorias) refers to this process. The papyrus in question further shows that the offices of strategos and nomarch were not in the course of time merged, that both were civil offices, and that the nomarch, together with the committee of councillors, was subject to the orders of the strategos, the strategos in turn receiving his orders from the procurator. In conclusion, Viereck suggests that in this year, on account of the millennial celebration of the founding of Rome, special efforts were made in collecting all the money available.

C. F. Lehmann, *Zur 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία*. L. undertakes to show that Aristotle is mistaken when, in the tenth chapter of the *'Αθηναίων πολιτεία*, he states that the weights, measures and coins of the system introduced by Solon were larger than those in use before that time. He does not believe in emending the words *ἀξέησιν* and *μείζω* to *κατάστασιν* and *μείω*, neither can he agree with Hultsch, who, after searching for a system that would conform to Aristotle's statements, announces it as his opinion that the Royal Babylonian-Persian system was the system in use before Solon's time. According to metrological and historical testimony, the Solonian mina weighed 436.6 g., the foot was from 295.6–297.7 mm.; the pre-Solonian mina weighed about 600 g., and the foot was from 328 to 331.3 mm. In each case, the cube of the foot (the metretes, the unit of volume) is 60 times the weight of the mina. This clearly shows that the Solonian weights and measures were smaller than the pre-Solonian. The Solonian mina of 436.6 g. cannot have been derived from the Royal Babylonian-Persian gold mina of 420 g., for the former belongs to the system of the common Babylonian silver mina (545.8–547.7 g.), the other is a secondary form of the Royal Babylonian gold mina (426.4–427.8 g.), which is itself a secondary form derived from the common Babylonian gold mina (409.3–410.8 g.). The Solonian mina is  $\frac{2}{3}$  and the pre-Solonian  $\frac{4}{3}$  of the common Babylonian silver mina. The talent of Solon is the Euboean. The pre-Solonian weights and measures were those of Pheidon. The Pheidonian system is totally distinct from the Aeginetan.

H. Dessau, *Ueber die Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. D. reaffirms and defends the views set forth in *Hermes* XXIV concerning the works of the so-called *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. He believes that these biographies were not written in the age of Diocletian and Constantine, but that they represent a big piece of forgery, and were composed by one and the same author, about the close of the 4th century. The paper is largely a rejoinder to the opposing views of Klebs (*Rh. Mus.* 45 and 47). There is also a discussion of the theory of Wölfflin (*Sitzungsber. d. philos.-philol. u. hist. Cl. d. k. bayr. Ak. d. W.* 1891, p. 465 ff.) regarding the authorship of these vitae.

E. Norden, *Scholia in Gregorii Nazianzeni orationes inedita*. Encouraged by the success of Piccolomini and others in making important finds among

the scholia to the orations of Gregory of Nazianzus, and owing to the lack of proper care on the part of A. Jahn in his publication of the scholia edited on the basis of three Munich MSS, Norden, in the hope of obtaining some valuable gleanings, undertook to re-examine the three Munich MSS and the Oxford MS. He also collated two Laurentian MSS. The results, which did not come up to his expectations, are recorded in the above paper. They consist of a number of hitherto unpublished scholia on philosophy, mythology, grammar, lexicography, etc., and a long string of emendations to the text of published scholia.

B. Keil, *Attisches Viertelbolzeichen*. The occurrence of the sign  $\text{)}$  in one of the Oropian inscriptions published Bull. de corr. hell. XV (1891), 490 ff., gives rise to a discussion concerning the origin of the sign. Keil shows that this was one of the Attic marks for  $\frac{1}{4}$  of an obol. The official mark was T, but at the time of the Oropian inscription, the mark  $\text{)}$  had probably come into more general use. As for the origin, K. thinks, with Boeckh, that it was due to the halving of O, which is occasionally used to designate an obol. C was used for  $\frac{1}{2}$  obol and  $\text{)}$  for  $\frac{1}{4}$  obol. K., however, calls attention to the fact that the mark of a semicircle was used on the tetartemorion ( $\frac{1}{4}$  obol) piece from 430-322 B. C., to designate its value.

Miscellen. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Zum Saecularorakel*. A reply in which W. defends his emendation (vid. supra) against Stengel.—M. Wellmann, *Nochmals Sostratos*. A reply to R. Wagner (vid. A. J. P. XIV, p. 507). W. thinks that Wagner failed in his attempt to identify the poet, the mythographer and the iologist Sostratos.—E. Wölfflin, *Die Annalen des Hortensius*. H. wrote no annals in the sense of a history of Rome beginning with Romulus. What he wrote was simply a sketch of the Social War, probably (Plut. Lucull., chap. 1) as a result of a kind of wager.—M. Wellmann, *Addend. to Hermes*, XXVI 546 f. Another fragment of Alexander of Myndos.—P. Viereck, *Addendum to V.'s article above reported*.

C. W. E. MILLER.

E. G. SIHLER.

#### NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK, 1892.

##### Fascicle I.

I. Pp. 1-22. J. Menrad treats the rhetorical figure sarcasmos and its use in Homer under three heads: I. The etymology of the word; II. Definitions given by the ancient writers, with critical discussion of each; III. Use of the figure in Homer. Sarcasmos, according to Scaliger, is biting scorn or mockery of that which is dead or dying. In Homer, excluding instances in which mere irony or scorn is expressed, he finds twenty cases of the use of the figure in the Iliad and three in the Odyssey. Of the twenty in the Iliad, nine are to be found in those portions included in Christ's Class I, ten in Class II, one in Class III, and none in Class IV; whence the conclusion that the figure is characteristic of the earliest stage of the poems and was used by the most ancient poets. The Odyssey affords less scope for this figure, owing to its theme, and the three instances noted all occur in the *μνηστηροφονία*.

2. Pp. 22-3. Otto Höfer identifies the goddess 'Οπαία, mentioned in a Peiraeen inscription, C. I. A. III 1280, with Cybele, of whom a common epithet was ὀπεία.

3. Pp. 23-8. In an inscription found during the excavation of the Cabiri temple at Thebes, and published by E. Szanto in the Mittheilungen of the German Archaeological Institute at Athens (vol. VII 2), a certain Damon is said to have received 24 drachmae, 5 obols and 9 chalkoi of silver, and in return to have dedicated a statue of the value of one gold stater and three Attic obols. Fr. Hultsch shows that, reckoned according to known Attic values, the ratio of the value of gold to silver was at the time of the inscription (200-171 B. C.) 10 to 1; but reckoned according to Theban values of that day, when the drachma contained 5.2 gr. silver instead of 6.2 gr. of the older period, the ratio is about 12 to 1, or, allowing for compensation for the work done, 11½ to 1.

4. Pp. 29-44. F. Blass sets forth the points of interest and value in the hypothesis to Demosthenes' Contra Midiam contained in the London Aristotle papyrus and in the beginning of a commentary on the same. The Kenyon Herodas papyrus is more important for the text of Demosthenes, as it contains the greater part of the third letter (§§1-38). The orthographical peculiarities of this text are noted and the text compared with that of Demosthenes that we before possessed.

5. Pp. 44-9. F. Roehl questions Köhler's conclusion that the fragment of the oration against Philippides, published in Kenyon's Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, was written by Hypereides. The misfortune suffered by Athens, which is mentioned in this oration, is assumed by Kenyon and Köhler to be that of Cheironeia in 336/5. This Roehl shows is indefensible. The expressions found in the oration refer better to the treatment of Athens by Antipater after the Lamian war. If this is a correct inference, the oration could not have been written by Hypereides, but must have been written by Demochares, Glaucippus, or one of their contemporaries.

6. Pp. 50-2. Hugo von Kleist considers the definition of ἀνδρεία in Plato's Laches, and defends the view of Bonitz that ἀνδρεία is "die auf sittlicher Einsicht beruhende Beharrlichkeit," as against the opposition of Zeller in his History of Greek Philosophy, bringing forward further confirmation from the dialogue itself.

7. Pp. 53-9. F. Polle (Ovid and Anaxagoras) observes a number of parallelisms between the preface of Diodorus and Ovid's Metamorphoses, in passages relating to the physical theory of the universe, and, following the indication of Diod. I 7, 7 (Ἐπιπίδης . . . μαθητὴς ὡν τοῦ Ἀναξαγόρου), comes to the conclusion that Ovid made a considerable use of Anaxagoras περὶ φύσεως.

8. Pp. 59-64. E. Grupe discusses a number of passages in Caesar de bel. Gal. which contain, as he believes, interpolations, introduced for the purpose of lending color to the author's style.

9. Pp. 65-74. K. Niemeyer controverts the interpretation of Horace, car. III 1-6, presented by Mommsen before the Prussian Academy (Jan. 24, 1889).



10. Pp. 74-9. K. Rossberg. Critical notes on Manilius, occasioned by Ellis's *Noctes Manilianae*.

11. Pp. 79-80. J. H. Schmalz shows that the adjective use of the fut. part. in Cic. Att. V 15, 3 (*reddituro*), is at variance with Ciceronian usage and that, in fact, the cod. Tornaesianus read *redditu iri*.

12. *Iocosum*. A catalogue blunder.

#### Fascicle 2.

13. Pp. 81-7. R. Vari shows that the codex of the Homeric Hymns found in Paris in 1890 (suppl. grec. 1095) is a sister manuscript to the one, denominated Δ, which Aurispa brought from Constantinople to Venice in 1423 and which is the source of the two manuscripts of the Hymns previously known, viz. Codex Laurentianus and Codex Estensis. The archetype of the three Vari denotes by Σ, and he gives a list of the variants in the text of the first and second Apollo hymns between its readings and those of the edition published by Abel (Leipzig and Prague, 1886).

14. P. 88. R. Leyde makes two corrections to the work of Adolf Bauer upon the historical value of the Aristotelian Constitution of Athens. 1. The archonships of Damasius are correctly placed as 583/2, 582/1. The first year is not the third of an Olympiad but the second, so that Δαμασίου τοῦ δευτέρου of the Parian Marble is the second year of the archonship of Damasius, not that of a second Damasius. 2. Bauer regards, though wrongly, the statement of Herodotus (V 65), that the rule of the Peisistratidae lasted 36 years, as an error. The correct explanation, given by Kenyon and the editors of Herodotus, is this: the actual length of the reign of Peisistratus was 19 years, to which are added the 17 years of Hippias, making 36 in all.

15. Pp. 89-95. Critical review by Fr. Reuss of O. Keller's *Xenophontis Historia Graeca*, ed. mai., Teubner, 1890.

16. Pp. 95-6. K. J. Liebhold proposes emendations to the following passages of Xenophon's *Hellenica*: II 3, 27; 38; VII 1, 14.

17. Pp. 97-105. Fr. Blass considers the fragment of the oration κατὰ Φιλίππιδου in Kenyon's *Classical Texts* from the British Museum as the work of Hypereides. It deals with a γραφή παρανόμων brought against Philippides for proposing to crown the proedroi in honor of Philip, as Blass thinks. The date he fixes at 337 B. C. or the first half of 336 B. C. The text is given, with critical notes and interpretation.

18. Pp. 105-7. Fr. Reuss removes the conflict between the statements of Diodorus and Polybius in regard to the date of the beginning of the reign of Hiero II by the following interpretation: Hiero was chosen military leader, not king, in 275/4, became king of Syracuse in 270, and was selected as king of the allied forces in 265/4.

19. Pp. 108-12. R. Schneider suggests solutions of difficulties in thirty passages of the *mimiambi* of Herondas.

20. Pp. 113-32. E. Schweder (*Ueber die Weltkarte und die Chorographie des Kaisers Augustus*) attempts to arrive at a conception of the geographical

work which must have accompanied and served as a commentary to the great chart of the world published at Augustus's instigation by M. Agrippa. Observation of the geographical data of Pliny and Mela, and the remains of the chart of Augustus (*tabula Peutingeriana*), leads him to the conclusion that the geographical commentary to the chart served as the source of Pliny and Mela, and that from their data a reconstruction of the work must proceed.

(8.) P. 132. E. Dettrich. Critical note on Caes. B. G. IV 29, 2.

21. Pp. 133-40. C. Haeberlin, *Analecta Apuleiana*. Conjectures to Apuleius.

22. Pp. 140-2. P. Müller. Critical observations on several passages of the *Germania*.

23. Pp. 142, 144. M. Mertens. On Ausonius, ad Grat. grat. act. 18, 82.

#### Fascicle 3.

24. Pp. 145-66. H. Welzhofer continues in two chapters his review of the history of the Persian wars begun in the *Jahrbücher* for 1891, pp. 145-59. In chapter III he treats of various points mentioned by Herodotus in regard to the march of Xerxes to Sardis and Abydos, the principal conclusion being that Xerxes did not undertake the expedition to Greece with a view of making war upon Athens and the other Greek states that did not voluntarily subject themselves, but that this march was rather of the nature of a royal visit. Doubtless a second purpose, though not the main one, was the subjugation of Athens. In chapter IV the march through Thrace is described, the stories of the crossing of the Hellespont and the enumeration of the army passing under criticism. Welzhofer shows that Herodotus made use of two sources of information, one good and the other poor, but did not notice that the statements were oftentimes contradictory.

25. Pp. 166-9. Regarding the use of the term *στρατηγὸς ὑπατοῦς* by Greek writers of Roman history, Th. Büttner-Wobst shows that Mommsen's identification of the term with *praetor maximus* rests on very dubious authority. Polybius (VI 14, 2) shows the meaning of the Greek term, and one must conclude that *ὑπατοῦς* must be a substantive and cannot be an adjective, nor can it be the equivalent of *maximus*. The designation *στρατηγὸς ὑπατοῦς* must be an attempt to designate the main functions of the Roman consul, *στρατηγός*, his *imperium militiae*, and *ὑπατοῦς*, *imperium domi*. But Greek names of Roman officials are rather translations of Roman names than terms invented by the writer to express the functions of the magistrate concerned. Hence it is probable that *στρατηγὸς ὑπατοῦς* had its counterpart in Latin, and that in the earliest times the Romans called their chief official *consul* with reference to his peace functions and *praetor* with reference to those of war. And as in Latin the single term *praetor* prevailed earlier and *consul* later, so in Greek *στρατηγός* was the common appellation in the earlier time, *ὑπατοῦς* later.

26. Pp. 170-6. K. Hude compares carefully and critically the accounts of the murder of Hipparchus as given by Thucydides and by Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.*, c. 17). His conclusion is that that of Aristotle is more reliable, and that the source of Aristotle's information was probably the same as that of Androtion, his contemporary.

27. Pp. 177-91. A consideration by H. Lewy of the following names in Greek mythology, in which use is made of cognate Hebrew and Syrian designations: 1. Elysion, 2. Scheria, 3. Kimmerioi, 4. Seirenes, 5. Eileithyia, 6. Artemis Oupis, 7. Ogygia, 8. Olen, 9. Amaltheia, 10. Skylla and Charybdis, 11. Acheron, 12. Bellerophon, 13. Baldir, Augustus, 14. Elioun (= Mygdalion, Amygdale), 15. Sarpedon, 16. Minos and Rhadamanthys, 17. Atymnos and Miletos, 18.Adrasteia, 19. Endymion, 20. Kronos, 21. Orion, 22. Niobe, 23. Priapos, 24. Leto.

28. Pp. 191-2. Otto Dingeldein upholds the reading and the interpretation offered by Pfeleiderer and Zeller of fragm. 11 (4) (Schuster and Bywater) of Heracleitus, as against the emendations suggested by Bernays and Cron.

29. Pp. 193-205. B. Maurenbrecher reviews O. Keller's *Lateinische Volksetymologie* (Leipzig, 1891) and F. Oskar Weise's *Charakteristik der lat. Sprache* (ib. 1891).

30. P. 205. E. Thewrewk von Ponor corrects a line of the *Vespae iudicium* (PLM. 4, 326).

31. Pp. 206-10. A. Giesecke attempts to show that Ariston of Chius, the Stoic, is the author of the dialogue on old age to which Cicero refers in the *Cato Maior* and of which he made use, of the work entitled *ῥητορικά*, and of other matter which is attributed to the peripatetic, Ariston of Keos.

32. Pp. 211-12. A. Fleckeisen, *Munitare*. Critical note on Cicero pro S. Roscio 140.

33. Pp. 212-15. A. Fleckeisen. Critical note on Plautus's *Stichus*, vs. 167, and *Miles El.*, vs. 1255.

34. Pp. 215-18. E. Redslob. Critical notes on the *Pseudolus* (vss. 279 and 497-9) and the *Stichus* (vs. 759) of Plautus.

35. Pp. 219-24. K. Petsch. A characterization of Orosius' use of his sources, based on the passage (VI 6, 5-7) describing the allotment of the Gallic provinces to Julius Caesar.

F. L. VAN CLEEF.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

## BRIEF MENTION.

In a paper read before the Philological Congress at Vienna in 1893, Professor HUGO JURENKA ranged himself under the banner of DRACHMANN, the same Drachmann that the enthusiastic Terpandrian FRACCAROLI, in his elaborate work on Pindar, *Odi di Pindaro dichiarate et tradotte*, has dismissed with curt contempt. Drachmann's book, entitled *Moderne Pindarfortolkning*, was put forth in 1891, and its object was to confute those who seek in Pindar's odes some law of composition. Professor Jurenka thinks that scant justice has been done the Danish scholar, and cites an article in which Bornemann lifted up his heel against him. What else was to be expected of Bornemann? The lover of Pindar has to accept his poet *cum onere*. Few trouble themselves much about Pindar, and, as in the Midsummer Night's Dream one cannot do without Bottom and Puck, so in Pindar one cannot do without Bornemann and Bury. Drachmann's work is written in Danish, and as he ignores English and American contributions to the study of Pindar, whereas Fraccaroli has sought light from every side, English and American students might return the compliment and excuse themselves from toiling over an unfamiliar idiom in order to make out, and perhaps imperfectly make out, the message which Drachmann has to convey. Even omniscient Germans show so often that they know only English enough to misunderstand and misinterpret those who write the foremost of all *Cultursprachen*, that one who is not a professed Scandinavian scholar might well hesitate to follow so bad an example. However, Drachmann has had the good sense to give at the end of his book a compendium of his views in Latin, and for this he is much to be commended. Indeed, in this flood of Danish, Swedish, Bohemian, Russian and Hungarian contributions to classical philology, one welcomes an occasional Latin raft. So Professor HANSEN, of Santiago, deems it necessary to give a Latin abstract of his Spanish disquisitions on Homer, though in his *Un pasaje de la Iliada* he sadly apologizes for a recent slip in Latin gender by his over-familiarity with Castilian. "Propter castellanae linguae consuetudinem me hebetiorem factum esse ad latine scribendi artem nuper sensi, cum in annalibus, qui anglice *The American Journal of Philology* vocantur, Peloponneso id genus attribuissem, quo ab Hispanis notatur (vol. XIII, p. 441)." But the Romans made similar slips in Greek gender by over-familiarity with Latin, and my long experience as an editor has made me tolerant. The main thing is to be understood by the mass of classical philologists; and while no one would wish to do away with the minor literatures of the world, surely Latin, Greek, English, French, German, Italian and Spanish would seem to be channels enough whereby to reach the world of scholars.

But this long-drawn sigh of a much-enduring editor leaves scant breath for the main subject, and Pindar, Jurenka, Drachmann and Fraccaroli are reserved for a more spacious table than *Brief Mention*, which in this number has been contracted to make room for original papers.

The Journal has from time to time admitted to its pages lists of *errata* in such standard works as are not likely to be reprinted in any reasonable time. Too much space ought not to be given to such registers, yet the value of them is undoubted, especially in the case of books intended for younger students, who may be led astray. So in SEYFFERT's attractive and handy *Dictionary of Classical Antiquity*, edited by two very competent and careful scholars, NETTLESHIP and SANDYS, I find that in the article *Aeschines* the battle of Chaeronea is put down 332 B. C. instead of 338, that *Callimachus* is credited with 'a very popular epic poem Hecate' for 'Hecale,' and *Hyperides* with a speech 'against Euxenippus' (*ὑπὲρ Εὐξενίππου*), and that *Pindar* is said to have been born about 522 and to have died in 422, aged eighty. In reading such corrections I have often wished that my *Pindar* were a standard work, but as it has the other qualification that it is not likely to be reprinted in any time to which I may reasonably or unreasonably look forward, I am tempted to do public penance for the following slips in the impression of 1890:

First two droll 'heterophemies': p. xxvi, l. 3 fr. bottom, for 'Ergoteles' read 'Psaumis'; p. 177, l. 8 fr. bottom, for 'marigold' read 'gillyflower.' Then p. xlvii, l. 13 fr. bottom, read '*B* 4444 = 16'; p. li, l. 12 fr. top, for 'exhibits' read 'exhibit'; p. lvii, l. 7 from top, read *1. 1. 1 + 1. 1*; p. 47, O. 11, 2, 3 read with Wilamowitz *ὑδάτων, ὁμβρίων*; v. 21 *διαλλάξαντο* (see A. J. P. XII 386); p. 95, P 5, 97 *dele* ; p. 125, l. 8 fr. top, read 'but even in the earlier time'; p. 159, l. 19 fr. top, for *ὀξείας* read *ὀξέος*; p. 251, l. 5 fr. top, read *οἰκτίρεσθαι*; p. 266, l. 4 fr. top, read *κληρόνες σωτήριοι | θανόντι*; p. 357, l. 4 fr. bottom, for 'second' read 'third.'

Small matters, it is true, some of them, but no philologist who has ever read can ever forget Dante's apostrophe:

O coscienza dignitosa e netta,  
Come t'è picciol fallo amaro morso.

When I introduced, if I introduced, the word 'anticipatory' into the treatment of the Greek condition,<sup>1</sup> I hoped that it would be limited to the *ἐάν*-condition, to which I distinctly restricted it; and I find, to my concern, that Mr. BALDWIN, in his very interesting *Morte d'Arthur*, and Professor HALE, in his *Anticipatory Subjunctive*, have applied the word, the one to English, the other to Latin, both with reference to my studies. Now, I have never blended, as Mr. BALDWIN does, 'anticipatory' and 'ideal,' nor have I confounded, as Professor HALE does, 'anticipatory' with 'prospective.' I should never dream of paralleling, as Professor Sonnenschein has done in his 'important note' to Dr. PALMER's *Amphitruo* (p. 271), the form *si* with pr. subj. followed by fut. ind., with the form *ἐάν* with subj. followed by fut. ind.; nor can I accept Professor HALE's parallel between the Greek subj. in comparison and the Lat. pr. and perf. subj. after *tamquam* and the like (A. J. P. XIII 62). Of course, I have no patent right to the word 'anticipatory,' but I regret that a loose use of it should bring back the confusion against which I protested eighteen years ago.

<sup>1</sup> Transactions Am. Phil. Ass. 1876, p. 7.



## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Aristophanes. *The Wasps of Aristophanes*, by C. E. Graves. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 243 pp. 16mo, cl., net \$1.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). *Pro L. Murena oratio*; ed. with introd. and notes by J. H. Freese. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. (Classical Series.) 16mo, cl., net 60 cts.

Gildersleeve (B. L.) and Lodge (G.) *Latin Grammar*, being the third ed. of Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar*, revised and enlarged. New York, *University Publ. Co.*, 1894. 550 pp. 8vo, \$1.20.

Gleason (C. W.) *The Gate to the Anabasis*. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. c. 4 + 47 pp. (School Classics.) Map, 16mo, cl., 45 cts.

Muss-Arnolt (W.) *A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language* (Assyrian-English-German). (In ca. 7-8 parts.) Part 1. gr. 8. S. 1-64. New York, *B. Westermann & Co.* @ \$1.25.

Smith (W.) *Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology and Geography*; based on the larger dictionaries by the late Sir W. Smith; rev. and in part rewritten by G. E. Marindin. New York, *Appleton*, 1894. 1019 pp. Maps, il., 8vo, hf. mor., \$6.

Tacitus (C. Cornelius). *Agricola and Germania*; with introd. and notes by H. M. Stephenson. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. (Pitt Press Series.) 16mo, cl., 80 cts.

Thucydides. Book 3; ed. on the basis of the Classen-Steup edition, by C. Foster Smith. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. c. 11 + 320 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.75.

Xenophon. *First Four Books of Anabasis*; with notes adapted to Goodwin's *Greek Grammar* and to Hadley's *Greek Grammar* (rev. by Allen); ed. by W. W. Goodwin and J. Williams White. With an illustrated dictionary to the *Anabasis* by J. W. White and M. H. Morgan. Rev. ed. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. c. 52 + 274 + 290 pp. Il. 12mo, hf. leather, \$1.65.

### ENGLISH.

Aeschylus. *Agamemnon*. By Watson. Cr. 8vo. *F. Norgate*, red., 2s. 6d.

*Anecdota Oxoniensia: the Elucidarium and other tracts in Welsh*, A. D. 1346. Ed. by J. M. Jones and J. Rhys. 4to, sd. *Clarendon Press*. 21s.

— *Hibernica Minora*; being a fragment of an Old Irish treatise on the Psalter. Ed. by K. Meyer. Sm. 4to, sd. *Clarendon Press*. 7s. 6d.

Bonwick (J.) *Irish Druids and Old Irish Religions*. Cr. 8vo. *Low*. 6s.

Cicero's Correspondence. Arranged according to its chronological order. With a revision of the text, a commentary, and introductory essays by R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser. Vol. 4. 8vo, 598 pp. Dublin, *Hodges. Longmans.* 12s.

— pro Milone. Ed. for schools and colleges by James S. Reid. 12mo, 160 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse.* 2s. 6d.

Euripides. The Hecuba. With introduction and notes by W. S. Hadley. Cr. 8vo, xx + 122 pp. *Cambridge University Press.* 2s. 6d.

Guirandon (T. G. de). Bolle Fulbe : manuel de la langue foule, parlée dans la Sénégambie et le Soudan. Grammaire, textes, vocabulaire. Sm. 8vo, viii + 144 pp. *Luzac.* 6s.

Henry (Victor). A Short Comparative Grammar of English and German. Tr. by the author. Cr. 8vo, xxviii + 394 pp. *Swan Sonnenschein.* 7s. 6d.

Johnson (F. E.) Muallakat : the seven poems suspended in the temple at Mecca. Tr. from the Arabic. With an introduction by Shaikh Faizul-labhai. 8vo, 262 pp. *Luzac.* 7s. 6d.

Judson's Burmese-English Dictionary. Revised and enlarged by Robert C. Stevenson. Roy. 8vo, xiv + 1188 + 6 pp. *Luzac.* Sd., net 25s.; hf.-bd., 30s.

Lagrange (M. C.) The Great Pyramid. Recently revised, with five new appendices by the author and a short note by C. Piazza Smyth. 8vo, 276 pp. *Burnet.* 10s. 6d.

McLaughlin (E. T.) Studies in Mediaeval Life and Literature. Cr. 8vo. *Putnam's Sons.* Net 5s.

Plato. Phaedo. Ed. with introduction, notes and appendices, by R. D. Archer-Hind. 2d ed. 8vo, 210 pp. *Macmillan.* Net 8s. 6d.

Plautus. Asinaria from the Text of Goetz and Schoell. With an introduction and notes by J. H. Gray. Cr. 8vo, xl + 126 pp. *Cambridge University Press.* 3s. 6d.

Tacitus. Germania. Ed. with introduction, etc., by R. F. Davis. 12mo. *Methuen.* 2s.

Temple (Major R. C.) Notes on Antiquities in Ramannadesa (the Talaing country of Burma). Reprinted from 'The Indian Antiquary.' Plates. 4to, sd., 64 pp. *Luzac.* 18s.

Terence. Phormio. With notes and introduction by A. Sloman. 2d ed., revised. 12mo, 176 pp. *Clarendon Press.* 3s.

Valentine (W. W.) New High German : a comparative study. Ed. by A. H. Keene. 2 vols. 8vo. *Isbister.* 30s.

Xenophon's Anabasis. Ed. by C. E. Brownrigg. Book 1. 12mo, 136 pp. *Blackie.* 1s. 6d.

## FRENCH.

Clédat (Léon). Grammaire raisonnée de la langue française. Avec préface de Gaston Paris. In-12. *Le Soudier.* 3 fr. 50.

Ernault (Emile) et Chevaldin (Emile). Manuel d'ortographe française simplifiée. In-8. *Bouillon.* 3 fr. 50.

Favre (Louis). Traité de diction à l'usage des écoles, etc. 2 vol. in-12. *Delagrave.* 7 fr.

Frey (le général). Annamites et extrême-occidentaux. Recherches sur l'origine des langues. Ouvrage illustré par deux Tonkinois. In-8. *Hachette*. 6 fr.

Gouin (François). Essai sur une réforme des méthodes d'enseignement. Exposé d'une nouvelle méthode linguistique. 2e édition. In-12. *Fischbacher*. 5 fr.

Halévy (J.) Les deux inscriptions hétéennes de Zindjtril. Texte, traduction et commentaire par J. Halévy. Gr. in-8. *Lanier*. 6 fr.

Robert (Ulysse). Les Fables de Phèdre. Edition paléographique, publiée d'après le manuscrit de Rosanbo. Gr. in-8. (Imprimerie nationale.) *Hachette*. 10 fr.

Spyridis (G.) Langue grecque actuelle ou moderne. In-8. *Flammarion*. 10 fr.

#### GERMAN.

Abhandlungen des archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminars der Universität Wien, hrsg. v. O. Benndorf u. E. Bormann. XI. Hft. gr. 8. Wien, A. Holder.—XI. Ueber homerische Waffen. Archäologische Untersuchgn. v. Wolfg. Reichel. 151 S. m. 55 Abbildgn. m. 5.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Hrsg. v. Rich. Förster. VII. Bd. 1. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, W. Koebner.—1. De oraculis chaldaicis. Scripsit Guilelm. Kroll. 78 S. m. 3.20.

Abou All al-Hosain b. Abdallah b. Sinâ ou d'Avicenne, traités mystiques. III. Fasc. gr. 4. E. J. Brill.—III. Traité sur l'amour. Traité sur la nature de la prière. Missive sur l'influence produite par la fréquentation des lieux saints et les prières qu'on y fait. Traité sur la délivrance de la crainte de la mort. Texte arabe accompagné de l'explication en français par M. A. F. Mehren. ix, 34 u. 61 S. m. 6.

Beiträge, Berliner, zur germanischen u. romanischen Philologie, veröffentlicht v. Emil Ebering. Romanische Abteilg. Nr. 1. gr. 8. B., C. Vogt.—1. Guiraut v. Bornelh, der Meister der Trobadors. 1. Die drei Tenzonen nach sämtl. Handschriften. 2. Drei bisher unbekannte, ihm zugeschriebene Gedichte, hrsg. v. Adf. Kolsen. 147 S. m. 3.60.

Boll (Frz.) Studien üb. Claudius Ptolemäus. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol.," 21. Suppl.-Bd.] gr. 8. 198 S. L., B. G. Teubner. m. 5.60.

Ciceronis (M. Tulli) orationes selectae. Scholarum in usum edidit Alois Kornitzer. Orationes pro T. Annio Milone, pro Q. Ligario, pro rege Deiotaro. Ed. II. 12. vi, 120 S. Wien, C. Gerold's Sohn. Kart., m. —90.

— — Orationes pro P. Sulla, pro A. Licinio Archia poeta. Tertium edidit K. 12. vi, 90 S. Wien, C. Gerold's Sohn. Kart., m. —80.

Corpus antiquissimorum poetarum Poloniae latinorum usque ad Ioannem Cochranovium. Vol. IV. gr. 8. Krakau, Buchh. d. poln. Verlags-Gesellschaft in Komm.—IV. Nicolai Hussoviani carmina, edidit Ioa. Pelczar. lv, 118 S. m. 3.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. VIII supplementum. Pars II. Fol. B., G. Reimer. Kart.—II. Inscriptionum provinciae Numidia latinarum supplementum, edd. Renatus Cagnat et Johs. Schmidt, commentariis instruxerunt Johs. Schmidt et Herm. Dessau. v u. S. 1667–1903. m. 22.

- Delitzsch (Frdr.) Assyrisches Handwörterbuch. 1. Tl. N bis T. gr. 8. S. 1-230. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 14.
- Epicteti dissertationes ab Arriano digestae, ad fidem codicis Bodleiani recensuit Henr. Schenkl. Accedunt fragmenta, enchiridion ex recensione Schweighaeuseri, gnomologiorum Epictetorum reliquiae, indices. 8. cxxiv, 720 S. m. 1 Lichtdr.-Taf. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 10.
- Euripides. Ausgewählte Tragödien. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. N. Wecklein. 5. Bdchn.: Phönissen. Mit 1 Taf.: Abbildung e. antiken Sarkophagreliefs. gr. 8. 181 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 1.80.
- Förstemann (Albr.) Zur Geschichte des Aeneasmythus. Litterargeschichtliche Studien. gr. 8. 104 S. Magdeburg, *Creutz.* m. 2.80.
- Förstemann (E.) Zur Entzifferung der Mayahandschriften. IV. Blatt 24 der Dresdener Mayahandschrift. gr. 8. 17 S. Dresden, *R. Bertling.* m. 1.
- Friedrich (Gust.) Q. Horatius Flaccus. Philologische Untersuchgn. gr. 8. vi, 232 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 6.
- Garbe (Rich.) Die Sâmkhya-Philosophie. Eine Darstellg. des ind. Rationalismus nach den Quellen. gr. 8. viii, 347 S. L., *H. Haessel.* m. 12.
- Giese (Frdr.) Untersuchungen üb. die 'Addâd auf Grund v. Stellen in altarabischen Dichtern. gr. 8. 58 S. B., *S. Calvary & Co.* m. 2.40.
- Grammatik, historische, der lateinischen Sprache. Bearb. v. H. Blase, G. Landgraf, J. H. Schmalz, Fr. Stolz, Jos. Thüssing, C. Wagener u. A. Weinhold. 1. Bd. 1. Hälfte. gr. 8. L., *B. G. Teubner.*—I 1. Einleitung u. Lautlehre v. Fr. Stolz. xii, 364 S. m. 7.
- Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. 6. Bd. 2. Tl. (19. Halbbd.) gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck.*—VI 2. Klassische Kunstarchäologie v. Prof. Sittl. 2. Tl. S. 305-624. m. 5.50.
- Hipparchi in Arati et Eudoxi phaenomena commentariorum libri III, ad codicum fidem recensuit, germanica interpretatione et commentariis instruxit Carol. Manitius. 8. xxxiv, 376 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 4.
- Homer's Gedichte. 1. Tl.: Die Odyssee. Bearb. v. Osk. Henke. Text. 1. u. 2. Bd. Buch 1-12, resp. Buch 13-24. gr. 8. vi, 219 u. 246 S. m. 2, resp. 1 Karte. L., *B. G. Teubner.* Kart., à m. 1.60.
- Homer's Odyssee. Zum Schulgebrauch bearb. u. erläutert v. Ernst Naumann. 1. Tl.: Gesang I bis Gesang XIII 184. Text u. Kommentar. gr. 8. Bielefeld, *Velhagen & Klasing.*—Text. xiii, 212 S. m. 1.50.—Kommentar. 147 S. m. 1.20.
- Iamblichus in Nicomachi arithmetica introductionem liber, ad fidem codicis Florentini edidit Hermenegild. Pistelli. 8. ix, 195 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2.40.
- Kittel (F.) A Kannaḍa-English Dictionary. Lex.-8. L., 1752 S. Mangalore. Basel, *Missionsbuchh. L., O. Harrassowitz in Komm.* Geb., m. 32.
- Kunst, Die, der Polyglottie. 42-43. Thl. 12. Wien, *A. Hartleben.* Geb. in Leinw., à m. 2.—42. Theoretisch-praktische Grammatik der annamitischen Sprache. Mit 9 Schrifttaf. Von A. Dirr. xiv, 164 S.—43. Prak-

tische Grammatik der mittelhochdeutschen Sprache. Von C. Kainz. viii, 174 S.

Lucreti Cari (T.) de rerum natura libri VI. Edidit Adph. Brieger. 8. lxxxiv, 206 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.80.

Meyer (Raphael). Einführung in das ältere Neuhochdeutsche zum Studium der Germanistik. gr. 8. vii, 99 S. L., *O. R. Reisland*. m. 1.60.

Meyer-Lübke (Wilh.) Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen. 2. Bd.: Formenlehre. 2. Abtlg. gr. 8. xix u. S. 401-672. L., *O. R. Reisland*. m. 8.

Ovid's Metamorphosen (in Auswahl), nebst einigen Abschnitten aus seinen eleg. Dichtgn., hrsg. v. Mart. Fickelscherer. Text. gr. 8. iv, 123 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. Kart., m. 1.

Pallioppi (Zaccaria) ed Pallioppi (Emil). Dizionari dels idioms Romauntschs d'Engiadin' ota e bassa, della Val Müstair, da Bravuogn e Filisur. 3. fasc. gr. 8. S. 385-576. Samedan. Basel, *A. Geering*. m. 5.

Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitg. Unter Mitwirkg. zahlreicher Fachgenossen hrsg. v. Geo. Wissowa. 2. Halbbd. gr. 8. 1. Bd. xv S. u. Sp. 1441-2902. St., *J. B. Metzler's Verl.* m. 15; in Lfgn. à m. 2.

Petri (Frdr.) Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Dichtersprache Klopstock's. gr. 8. 84 S. Greifswald, *H. Jaeger in Komm.* m. 2.

Porta linguarum orientalium, inchoavit J. H. Petermann, continuavit Herm. L. Strack. Pars IV. 8. B., *Reuther & Reichard*.—IV. Arabische Grammatik. Paradigmen, Litteratur, Uebungsstücke u. Glossar. Von A. Socin. 3. Aufl. xv, 170 u. 158 S. m. 6; geb., m. 6.80.

Prisciani (Theodori). Euporiston libri III cum Physicorum fragmento et additamentis Pseudo-Theodoreis editi a Valentino Rose. Accedunt Vindiciani Afri quae feruntur reliquiae. 8. xxviii, 554 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 5.

Schellwien (Alfr.) De Cledonii in Donatum commentario. Diss. gr. 8. 64 S. Königsberg, *W. Koch*. m. 1.

Schmidt (Adf. M. A.) Zum Sprachgebrauche des Livius in den Büchern I, II, XXI u. XXII. 1. Thl. gr. 8. 30 S. L., *G. Fock in Komm.* m. 1.

Scholia in Aeschyli Persas. Recensuit, apparatu critico instruxit, cum praefatione de archetypo codicum Aeschyli scripta edidit Osc. Dähnhardt. 8. lxvi, 275 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.60.

Schultze (Mart.) Grammatik der hindustanischen Sprache. Hindī u. Urdū, in ind., arab. u. latein. Schrift. gr. 8. iv, 56 S. L., *K. Scholtze*. m. 2.40.

Siewert (Paul). Plautus in Amphitruone fabula quomodo exemplar graecum transtulerit. gr. 8. 85 S. L., *G. Fock*. m. 2.

Studien, griechische, Hermann Lipsius zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht. gr. 8. iii, 187 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 6.

Studien, semitische. Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift f. Assyriologie. Hrsg. v. Carl Bezold. 1-3. Hft. gr. 8. B., *E. Felber*.—1. Fragmente aus dem Muğrib des Ibn Sa'id. Hrsg. v. K. Vollers. I. Bericht üb. die Handschrift u. das Leben des Ahmed ibn Tūlūn v. Ibn Sa'id nach Ibn



ed-Dājā. xxiv, 77 S. m. 8.—2, 3. The Life of Rabban Hōrmīzd and the Foundation of his Monastery at Al-Ḳōsh. A metrical discourse by Wahlē, surnamed Sergius of Ādhōrbāljān. The Syriac text edited, with glosses, etc., from a rare manuscript by Keeper E. A. Wallis Budge. viii, 168 S. m. 16.

Stumme (Hans). Tripolitanisch-tunisische Beduinenlieder. gr. 8. x, 153 S. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 5.

Thukydides. Die Geschichte des Peloponnesischen Krieges, zum Gebrauch f. Schüler hrsg. v. Frz. Müller. 2 Tle. Text u. Kommentar. gr. 8. Bielefeld, *Velhagen & Klasing*. Geb., m. 6.80.—1. Buch I bis Buch IV 24, 2. Text (viii, 232 S.), m. 1.50; Kommentar (242 S.), m. 1.80.—2. Buch V 25 bis VIII. Text (viii, 150 S. m. 1 farb. Karte), m. 1.50; Kommentar (179 S.), m. 1.50.

Villatte (Césaire). Parisismen. Ein Supplement zu allen franz.-deutschen Wörterbüchern. 4. Aufl. gr. 8. xvi, 326 S. B., *Langenscheidt*. m. 5; geb., m. 5.60.

Virorum clarorum saeculi XVI et XVII epistolae selectae. E codicibus manuscriptis Gottingensibus edidit et adnotationibus instruxit Ernestus Weber. 8. x, 195 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Wulfing (J. Ernst). Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen. 1. Tl. Hauptwort—Artikel—Eigenschaftswort—Zahlwort—Fürwort. gr. 8. xxix, 491 S. Bonn, *P. Hanstein*. m. 12.

Wustmann (Rud.) Verba perfectiva, namentlich im Heliand. gr. 8. ii, 94 S. L., *F. W. Grunow*. m. 2.

Zangemeister (Karl) u. Braune (Wilh.) Bruchstücke der altsächsischen Bibeldichtung aus der Bibliotheca Palatina. [Aus "Neue Heidelb. Jahrbh."] gr. 8. 94 S. Heidelberg, *G. Koester*. m. 1.50.

Zumetikos (Alex. M.) De Alexandri Olympiadisque epistularum fontibus et reliquiis. Diss. gr. 8. iv, 148 S. B., *Mayer & Müller*. m. 2.

## ITALIAN.

Cordenons (F.) Un po' più di luce sulle origini, idioma e sistema di scrittura degli Euganei-veneti. Padova. 8vo, fig., p. 212. L. 6.

Dal Pozzo di Mombello (G.) Glossario etimologico piemontese. 5a edizione. Torino. 8vo, p. 420. L. 5.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Acta M. Anastasii Persae ab H. Usenero edita. Bonnae, *Formis C. Georgi*, MDCCCXCIV.

Belling (Henricus). Quaestiones Tibullianae. (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresber. des Askanischen Gymnasiums zu Berlin.) Berlin, *R. Gaertner's Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1894.

Bonafous (Raymond). Henri de Kleist: sa vie et ses œuvres. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1894.

Bureau of Ethnology. Tenth Annual Report, 1888-89, by J. W. Powell. Washington, D. C., 1893.

Butler (George P.) School English. New York, Cinc. and Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1894. 75 cts.

Caesaris (C. Iulii) Belli Gallici Libri VII. A. Hirtii Liber VIII. Recensuit, apparatu critico instruxit Henricus Meusel. Berolini, *W. Weber*, MDCCCXCIV.

— Belli Gallici Libri VII. A. Hirtii Liber VIII. Für den Schulgebrauch herausg. von H. Meusel. Berlin, *W. Weber*, 1894.

Elucidarium and other tracts in Welsh from Llyvyr agkyr llandewivrevi, A. D. 1346. Ed. by J. Morris Jones and John Rhys. (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Mediaeval and Modern Series. Part VI.) Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894.

English Grammar for Common Schools, by R. C. and Thomas Metcalf. New York, Cinc. and Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1894. 60 cts.

Galen (Claudii) Protreptici quae supersunt ed. Georgius Kaibel. Berolini, *Apud Weidmannos*, MDCCCXCIV. 2 m.

Gildersleeve (B. L.) and Lodge (G.) Latin Grammar, being the third ed. of Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar. New York, *University Publ. Co.*, 1894. \$1.20.

Gleason (C. W.) The Gate to the Anabasis. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. \$1.25.

Hale (W. G.) 'Extended' and 'Remote' Deliberatives in Greek. Extr. from the Transactions of the American Philological Association, vol. XXIV (1893). 1894.

Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature. Vol. II. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894.

Hibernica Minora, being a fragment of an Old Irish treatise on the Psalter. Ed. by Kuno Meyer. (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Mediaeval and Modern Series. Part VIII.) Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894.

Homers Odyssee. Schulausgabe von Paul Cauer. Erster Theil (a-μ). Zweite, verbesserte Aufl. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1894. geb., 1 m.

Homer's Odyssey. Books V-VIII. Ed. on the basis of Ameis-Hentze by B. Perrin. (White and Seymour Series.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. \$1.50.

Indogermanische Forschungen, herausg. von Karl Brugmann u. Wilhelm Streitberg. Vierter Band. Strassburg, *Karl J. Trübner*, 1894. 16 m.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XIV, Part I. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894.

Lord (Frances E.) The Roman Pronunciation of Latin. Boston and London, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894.

Maxwell's English Course. First Book in English. New York, Cinc. and Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1894.

Maxwell (W. H.) Introductory Lessons in English Grammar. New York, Cinc. and Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1894. 40 cts.

Monro (D. B.) The Modes of Ancient Greek Music. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 8s. 6d.

Monuments grecs, publiés par l'Association pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France. Nos. 19-20. Deuxième vol. Paris, *Maisonneuve et Cie.*, 1893.

Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi. Tredie Række. Andet Bind, 1-4 Hæfte. København, *Gyldendal*, 1893.

Offord (J.), Jr. Recent Discoveries in Patristic Literature. (Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, vol. XVI, part II.) London, 1894.

Oriental Studies. A selection of the papers read before the Oriental Club of Philadelphia, 1888-94. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894.

Paulini Nolani (S. Pontii Meropii). Pars I. Epistulae ex recensione G. de Hartel. (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum editum consilio et impensis academiae litterarum Caesariae Vindobonensis, vol. XXVIII.) Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MDCCCLXXXIII.

Pernice (Erich). Griechische Gewichte, gesammelt, beschrieben u. erläutert. Mit einer Tafel. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1894. 6 m.

Pilling (James C.) Bibliography of the Wakashan Languages. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology.) Washington, D. C., 1894.

Pliny. Selections from the Letters of the Younger P. Ed. with notes and introd. by S. B. Platner. Boston, *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1894.

Pollard (John Garland). The Pamunkey Indians of Virginia. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology.) Washington, D. C., 1894.

Preller (L.) Griechische Mythologie. Erster Band. Zweite Hälfte. Vierte Aufl. herausg. von Carl Robert. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1894. 8 m.

Scholia antiqua in Q. Horatium Flaccum. Recensuerunt Alfred Holder et Otto Keller. Volumen I. Porphyrius Commentum. Recensuit Alfred Holder. Ad Aeni Pontem, *Sumptibus et Typis Wagneri*, MDCCCLXXXIII.

Sittl (K.) Klassische Kunstarchaeologie. (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, in Verbindung mit zahlreichen Gelehrten herausg. von Iwan von Müller. Band VI. Bogen 20-39.) München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1894. 5 m. 50 pf.

Small (Albion W.) and Vincent (George E.) An Introduction to the Study of Society. New York, Cinc. and Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1894. \$1.80.

Smith (C. Alphonso). Repetition and Parallelism in English Verse. New York, *University Publ. Co.*, 1894.

Storm (Theodor). Geschichten aus der Tonne. Ed. by Charles F. Brusie. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. 65 cts.

Studia Sinaitica. No. I. Catalogue of the Syriac MSS in the Convent of S. Catharine on Mount Sinai. Compiled by Agnes Smith Lewis. London, *C. J. Clay & Sons*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 10s. 6d.

— No. II. An Arabic Version of the Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, with part of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Ed. by Margaret D. Gibson. London, *C. J. Clay*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 5s.

— No. III. Catalogue of the Arabic MSS in the Convent of S. Catharine on Mount Sinai. Compiled by Margaret Dunlop Gibson. London, *C. J. Clay*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 6s.

Sweet (Henry). An Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse. With grammar, metre, notes and glossary. Seventh ed., enlarged and partly rewritten. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894.

Tacitus. Dialogus de oratoribus. Ed. with introd., notes and indexes by C. E. Bennett. Boston and London, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. 80 cts.

Taciti (P. Cornelii) Dialogus de oratoribus. Edited with prolegomena, critical apparatus, exegetical and critical notes, bibliography and indexes, by Alfred Gudeman. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. \$2.50.

Thomas (Cyrus). The Maya Year. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology.) Washington, D. C., 1894.

Thomas (Llewelyn). The Earliest Translation of the Old Testament into the Basque Language. (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Mediaeval and Modern Series. Part X.) Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894.

Tyrrell (R. Y.) The Homeric Hymns. Reprint from *Hermathena*, IX (No. XX), 1894.

Uhlenbeck (C. C.) Handboek der indische Klankleer. Leiden, *Blankenbergh & Co.*, 1894.

Van Daell (Alphonse). An Introduction to French Authors, being a Reader for Beginners. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. 90 cts.

Waldstein (Charles). Excavations of the Heraion of Argos. (American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Bulletin III.)

Walton (Alice). The Cult of Asklepios. (Cornell University Studies, No. III.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894.

Weil (Henri). Observations sur des textes d'Euripide et d'Eschyle. *Revue de Philologie*, Juillet, 1894. Tirage à part.

Xenophon's Hellenica. Books I and II. Ed. with notes by R. W. Blake. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1894. \$1.20.